UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2572nd MEETING: 11 MARCH 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2572)	1
Tribute to the memory of Mr. Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 25 February 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16983)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2572nd MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 11 March 1985, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Blaise RABETAFIKA (Madagascar).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2572)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:
   Letter dated 25 February 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16983)

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): It was with deep sorrow that we learned of the passing of an outstanding statesman of our day, Mr. Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. As the principal United Nations organ on which Member States have conferred primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council must pay a tribute to President Chernenko for his great devotion to the cause of peace and security for all peoples, the cessation of the arms race and the elimination of the threat of a nuclear war.

2. I should like, as President of the Council and on behalf of its members, to express to the representative of the Soviet Union and, through him, to the Government of the Soviet Union, the Soviet people and the family of the deceased, our sincere condolences.

3. I now invite the members of the Council to stand and observe a minute of silence.

The representatives, standing, observed a minute of silence.

4. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): On behalf of the Soviet delegation, I should like to express our sincere gratitude to you, Mr. President, for the statement you just made on behalf of the members of the Council and to thank you for your condolences in connection with the death of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. The Soviet State and people have suffered a great loss. An outstanding Party and State official has passed away, an unswerving fighter for the cause of strengthening peace and international co-operation.

5. The activities of Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko in his high posts in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet State earned him great respect throughout the world. He devoted his entire life to faithfully serving the Soviet people and will for ever remain in the memory of the Soviet people and of the whole of progressive mankind.

6. The message of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Sovet Union, of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and of the Council of Ministers of the USSR on the occasion of the death of Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko on 11 March, stresses the consistent nature of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union; it reads as follows:

> "The Soviet State has done and is doing all that is possible and required to strengthen the socialist community, consolidate the positions of socialism throughout the world, avert nuclear catastrophe and ensure lasting peace.
>
> "We wish to see cessation of the arms race and are persistently striving to and to avert the militarization of outer space. Our ultimate objective is the total destruction of nuclear weapons throughout the planet and the complete elimination of the threat of nuclear war. The Soviet Union has unswervingly favoured and continues to favour constructive dialogue, practical measures leading to the reduction of international tensions and the establishment of an atmosphere of trust, co-operation and mutual understanding among all peoples and States."

7. The Soviet delegation will convey the condolences that have been expressed here to the Government of the Soviet Union, the Soviet people and the bereaved family.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 25 February 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16983)

8. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken by the Council at previous meetings [*2568th and 2570th meetings*], I invite the representative of Lebanon to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Algeria, Bangladesh, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Jordan, Qatar, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fakhouri (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. Wasiuddin (Bangladesh), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Al-Alfi (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Netanyahu (Israel), Mr. Kasrawi (Jordan), Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Al-Shaali (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam) and Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

9. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Senegal and the Sudan in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Phedonos-Vadet (Cyprus), Mr. César (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Alatas (Indonesia), Mr. Icaza Gallard (Nicaragua), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Nowak (Poland), Mr. Shihabi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Sarré (Senegal) and Mr. Adam (Sudan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

10. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 7 March [*S/17011*] from the representative of Democratic Yemen. The text of the letter is as follows:

> "I have the honour to request that the Security Council extend an invitation to Mr. Zehdi Terzi, observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization, to participate in the discussion on the item 'The Situation in the Middle East', in accordance with the Council's usual practice."

11. The proposal by the representative of Democratic Yemen is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, but if approved by the Council, the invitation to participate in the discussion would confer on the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) the same rights of participation as those conferred on Member States pursuant to rule 37. Does any member of the Council wish to speak on this proposal?

12. Mr. CLARK (United States of America): The United States opposes extending to the PLO the same rights of participation in the proceedings of the Council as if that organization represented a Member State. We have consistently taken the position that, under the provisions of the rules of procedure the only legal basis on which the Council may grant a hearing to persons speaking on behalf of non-governmental entities is rule 39.

13. For many decades, the United States has supported a generous interpretation of rule 39, and we would not object in this case. We are, however, opposed to special *ad hoc* departures from orderly procedure. In particular, the United States does not agree with the recent practice of the Council, which appears selectively to try to enhance the prestige of those who wish to speak in the Council through a departure from the rules of procedure. We consider this special practice to be without legal foundation and to constitute an abuse of the rules. The integrity of the Council's procedures, we believe, is very important.

14. For these reasons, the United States requests that you, Mr. President, put the terms of the proposed invitation to the vote. The United States will vote against.

15. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): If no other member of the Council wishes to speak at this stage, I shall take it that the Council is prepared to vote on the proposal by Democratic Yemen.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Burkina Faso, China, Egypt, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Denmark, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The proposal was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

16. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): Australia has just abstained in the voting on the question before the Council. We did so because, in our view, the observer of the PLO should properly be invited to participate on the same basis as representatives of other organizations or bodies which are not States. To have supported a measure which would confer upon the PLO the same rights as Member States would imply that Australia recognizes the PLO. Australia does not recognize the PLO and will not do so while it maintains its denial of Israel's right to exist.

17. Australia acknowledges that the PLO, which represents the opinion of a very significant portion of the Palestinian people, should be included in the process of seeking a comprehensive settlement. It believes, however, that the PLO's opportunity to engage productively in such a process is limited, and perhaps non-existent, while it persists in denying Israel's right to exist.

18. Australia does not object in principle to the observer of the PLO appearing before the Council. As will be clear, our objection is to the basis upon which this was proposed.

19. Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): The Danish delegation abstained in the vote on the proposal of participation of the PLO in the Council's debate. In doing so, my delegation was guided by the rules of procedure which the Council has itself established. The procedure followed today is clearly designed to grant the PLO a status similar to that of a Member State. This does not reflect the true relationship of the PLO to the Organization, and, therefore, we cannot support it.

20. This does not mean, however, that my delegation objects to the PLO being heard by the Council during the present debate.

21. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The first speaker is the representative of Lebanon, on whom I now call.

22. Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) (*interpretation from Arabic*): First, on behalf of Lebanon and its people, I extend to the Soviet delegation, which represents a friendly country, and through it to the Soviet Government and people, our sincerest condolences on the passing of Mr. Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

23. The increasing escalation of Israeli practices is confirmed hour by hour. These practices are becoming ever more barbaric as time goes on, but anyone who thought that our determination would be shaken and that we would yield our positions would be badly mistaken.

24. This very morning, Israeli forces launched a large-scale raid against the village of Zarrariye, north of the Litani River, in the region from which Israel had withdrawn a few weeks ago and where there is still a small unit of the Lebanese army. The first information we have received on this matter is that the Israeli forces encircled the village with a large number of tanks and troop-transport vehicles and proceeded to bomb the village, entered it and captured 24 of its inhabitants, mowing them down by gunfire before the very eyes of their families. These forces also opened fire on the Lebanese unit which was defending the village and its inhabitants. A number of soldiers were wounded; others were arrested. The inhabitants joined the Lebanese soldiers in defending their village against the Israeli aggressor.

25. These battles are continuing. Naval units of the Israeli forces are continuing to bombard neighbouring villages along the Lebanese coast, north of Saida.

26. This escalation undertaken by Israeli forces is a most serious matter. Massacre follows massacre in Lebanese villages. There are no means to dissuade the Israeli forces. If they continue their escalation, if they continue to flout the provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949[1] and the conventions on human rights, if they continue to cross the Litani River and to enter the region and engage in their inhumane practices against the Lebanese army and villages, how can we be sure that this withdrawal is indeed a genuine withdrawal, as these forces state? How can we ensure the safety of our inhabitants? How can we protect their property and their rights?

27. Israel has embarked on an escalation of its barbaric acts. This will have disastrous consequences that will turn against Israel itself. How long will the Council remain a silent witness to these barbaric acts? At least once, the Council should show that it can meet its responsibilities and that it is worthy of the confidence placed in it.

28. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): It was with deep sorrow that we learned this morning of the passing away of Mr. Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. His death is a profound loss to the Government and people of that great country as well as to all those who had valued his contribution to world peace and held high expectations of his taking an even greater role in international security, particularly in the field of disarmament. On behalf of my delegation, therefore, I join in the expression of condolences to the people and Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, to its Mission and to the bereaved family.

29. My delegation has been following with serious concern the disturbing news reports of recent days indicating brutal reprisals by Israeli forces against the civilian population in southern Lebanon. Such actions as wanton killings without due process of law, demolition of homes and other measures going beyond any pretext of military necessity appear to violate in particular the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in time of War, of 12 August 1949.[2]

30. For humanitarian reasons, the Convention necessarily places strict obligations on the occupying Power which exercises authority in the area. It is therefore incumbent on Israel to satisfy the international community on these concerns and to desist from any such actions. To all intents and purposes, the Israeli representative, in his statement before the Council the other day [*2568th meeting*], has not satisfied my delegation's concern in this regard. On the contrary, our concern has been heightened by the serious repercussions which the inhumane actions, as long as they continue, will likely have on the peace and international security in the area. Recent incidents at Ma'rakah

are bound to inflame emotions and exacerbate tension even further.

31. Thailand's position on the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 is clear on this matter. We condemn all practices and measures against the civilian population in southern Lebanon which are in violation of its provisions.

32. It is also clear that the root cause of the bloodshed and suffering in this instance is the continuing illegal occupation of Lebanese territory by Israeli forces. This occupation, in turn, has led to mounting resistance on the part of the Lebanese. It is therefore necessary to eliminate this root cause in order to spare all parties further bloodshed and suffering. It is for this reason that my delegation is gratified to learn of the completion of the first phase of the Israeli withdrawal and the commencement of the second phase. With the increasing difficulties, there is even greater urgency that the total withdrawal of Israeli forces to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon be accomplished expeditiously and in an uninterrupted manner.

33. Thailand's basic position can be summed up as follows. Firstly, Lebanon's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity must be respected by all parties concerned. My delegation therefore supports the efforts of the Lebanese Government to extend its authority over all of its territory. Secondly, there must be no interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon. To ensure this, all foreign forces must withdraw from Lebanon, unless the Lebanese Government, in the exercise of its sovereign right, chooses otherwise. Thirdly, all relevant resolutions of the Council must be implemented without undue delay. Fourthly, disputes must be settled by peaceful means, taking into account the legitimate concerns of the parties.

34. While withdrawal is under way, the civilian population, including the Palestinian refugees, must be spared from repressive measures. It is sad enough that they are caught in the crossfire; it is worse when they are subjected to organized actions by the occupying forces. When the Israeli representative said before the Council that the Israeli authorities would use every means to stop the killings, we hope he meant the killings on both sides. Is it not worse for all concerned to leave feelings of bitter enmity and humiliation in the aftermath of the withdrawal which is now under way?

35. Part of the present difficulties stem from the lack of agreed arrangements which would ensure security, particularly for the civilian population, in the absence of impartial monitoring and protection. Its safety would certainly be enhanced if there were agreed arrangements between the parties directly involved. For that reason, we regret the breakdown in the Naqoura talks.

36. At this delicate stage, the increasing difficulties appear to complicate the withdrawal process and exacerbate the plight of the civilians, thereby prolonging their anguish. My delegation therefore joins in the appeal for a resumption of the Naqoura talks as soon as possible. We hope that an agreement can be reached to enable the Israeli withdrawal to proceed unimpeded with an expeditious timetable. In this connection, my delegation greatly appreciates the initiatives and efforts of the Secretary-General and his representative, as well as their ongoing good offices, to have the talks resumed. Consequently, we note with regret the absence of any reference to this important point in the draft resolution before the Council [*S/17000*].

37. The Thai delegation sees continuing usefulness for the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), despite changes in the situation. It may perhaps be said with some justification that, because of recent developments, there is greater necessity for the continuation of its mandate. Both the contributing Governments and the men themselves deserve our gratitude for the sacrifices they have to bear, pending the final resolution of the conflict. It should, therefore, be a matter of serious concern to the Council to enhance the safety of the forces in the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations who are caught in the present situation. My delegation has learned with dismay that a threat has been made against some of them because of their nationalities and the positions that their Governments—which represent sovereign member States—take in the Council.

38. It is therefore desirable, from the point of view of my delegation, that the Council take an initiative with a view to alleviating this concern and deploring any threat of violence against any member State in the exercise of its prerogatives in the Council.

39. We also note with regret the absence of any specific reference to UNIFIL in the draft resolution before the Council.

40. Regarding that draft resolution, my delegation's view, based on the foregoing statement of Thailands's basic position, is as follows. Firstly, my delegation's strong preference is for either a consensus resolution or a statement of the President which would also require a consensus, since we regard the issue at hand as one of humanitarian concern to all. Secondly, since my delegation believes that at this delicate juncture the interests of all parties would be better served if the total withdrawal of Israeli forces to the international border of Lebanon were accomplished without interruption or undue delay, it has reservations on the wording of some paragraphs of the draft resolution. In particular, in the first operative paragraph the Council should condemn all practices and measures against the civilian population that are in violation of international law and the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949.

41. Consequently, my delegation would prefer not to have the draft resolution pressed to the vote. However, this is unfortunately not the case, and the issue under consideration is limited to the situation in the areas occupied by Israel. In view of Thailand's basic position, and with the foregoing observations and reservations on record, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

42. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, observer of the League of Arab States, to whom the Council has extended an invitation, in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, at its 2568th meeting. I invite him to take a place as the Council table and to make his statement.

43. Mr. MAKSOUD: I should like at the outset to join in the universal condolences to the Soviet delegation on the untimely departure of Konstantin Chernenko, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and General Secretary of the Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Needless to say, the League of Arab States as an organization and the entire Arab people share in the grief, and they wish that the new leadership in the Soviet Union will continue the commitment to the interests of peace, international security and development.

44. We have just heard the representative of Lebanon speak about the latest escalation in the situation in Lebanon by the Israeli occupation army. I just want to read out what has been stated by the Israelis today:

> "The Lebanese army was told not to interfere with the IDF"—the so-called Israeli Defence Force—"action. And only after they fired at our troops were they shot at and 10 of their soldiers detained."

45. This might sound like a routine statement; yet it entails a large measure of indications of what the Israeli position in southern Lebanon is. What it is is that the Lebanese army, exercising its full sovereign prerogatives in part of its territory to defend its own lands against Israeli actions which are in violation of Lebanese sovereignty, of Security Council resolutions and of the Charter of the United Nations, is challenged, on its own territory, by the Israeli army of occupation. The Israeli army states emphatically that the Lebanese army interrupted its action. The question is: does the Lebanese army have the right to interrupt Israeli action on territory that belongs to Lebanon?—a very simple question, perhaps not even necessary to repeat.

46. Yet what we are faced with, in Israeli semantics, is that they can render the most elementary and obvious facts—obvious legally recognized rights—as controversial, debatable and discussable, so that we who are on the side of the aggrieved party appear to be repetitious and redundant, continuing to insist on what should have been solved a long time ago. This is a technique utilized by Israel repeatedly in order to make what is obvious and elementary—the rights of Lebanon—something debatable and controversial, at least for Israel itself and those who support it.

47. We are also faced with semantic acrobatics in regard to a very elementary situation. All of a sudden people in the south of Lebanon resisting occupation—as every decent human being does when faced with occupation—are called terrorists. Israel repeats the word and the description "terrorist", and it conditions the reflexes so that after a certain time, when we seek to assert what is elementary, it again becomes controversial and the need arises—at that particular moment—for "even-handed and balanced attitudes". It is very easy for Israel to subject every objective reality to controversy and thus make objective reality no longer elementary but debatable. Thereby Israel seeks, unfortunately, to persuade certain Member States that what is required is an objective approach that equates Israel, the aggressor, with the victims of aggression. It is a technique which the international body has not, fortunately, succumbed to, but the device is utilized in order to paralyse the emerging consensus in the Council. To ascribe to the resistance movement in Lebanon—a movement which is one of the most glorious expressions of national commitment—the term "terrorist" puts the resistance in the noble category of many previous resistance movements and national liberation movements that were described by racists and colonialists as terrorists. So whether they are called terrorists by the Israelis or not is fundamentally and historically immaterial, because resistance in the south of Lebanon is in the same historical tradition as all the liberation movements that have led to the universal character and representation of this body of the United Nations.

48. Furthermore, the Israeli representative stated before the Council, without even batting an eyelid, that "there are certain basic assumptions sovereign States accept and expect from one another" [*2568th meeting, para. 69*].

49. When you hear this, at face value it is obvious that it is a correct statement, but when it comes from Israel it is very interesting to ask over what territories Israel exercises sovereignty. Has Israel—from its inception until today—ever been on record as able to clarify and define the parameters of its sovereignty so that others would not encroach upon it? So to claim judiciously that sovereign States have sovereign rights, in order that they will not be encroached upon it is important that the Council be able to extract from Israel a definition of the territorial parameters over which it claims sovereignty.

50. Conversely, Israel is in obvious violation of the sovereignty of many Arab States: of Egypt in Tabah, of Syria in the Golan Heights, of the Palestinian territory on the West Bank, in Jerusalem and Gaza—and in Lebanon, which is the primary subject of this debate. The sovereignty of Lebanon has been violated repeatedly since 1978 and before by Israel. And here we come to a central issue which has been frequently raised in this debate—why the Naqoura talks on military arrangements have not resumed.

51. The answer is very clear, very obvious: Israel remains unwilling to determine the timetable for its withdrawal in compliance with Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), the latter of which demands that it should withdraw forthwith from all occupied Lebanese territories.

52. The Naqoura talks have been envisaged as a modality through which implementation of the timetable would take place and the arrangements for the withdrawals would be made palatable at the lowest human costs. Instead, Israel

declared that it wanted to withdraw, made certain logistical arrangements and withdrew from certain territories because of the costs that had been inflicted by the resistance to its occupation. But then there arose its internal dilemma: the desire of one of the so-called coalition partners to have a visible result in the south of Lebanon so as to absolve Israel from the crime of its invasion of Lebanon, and the desire of the other part of the coalition to satisfy an emerging opposition to the continued Israeli occupation of Lebanon. So the equivocation on the part of Israel on withdrawing fully and forthwith from Lebanon is a projection of the internal dilemma and contradiction, at the expense of human life in southern Lebanon.

53. Then we are told that Israel has declared its intention to withdraw and that this should be taken at face value. The answer to that is that in 1978 a historical precedent was established whereby declared its withdrawal from Lebanon, and instead of allowing the legitimate Government of Lebanon to exercise its full authority and deploy its army in the south of Lebanon, it sought, through the extension of its mercenary forces, to maintain Lebanon's sovereignty as a fiction and introduced what I have repeatedly called the notion of Lebanon's "suspended sovereignty" over the south of Lebanon. This "suspended sovereignty" was a prescription for the subsequent Israeli invasion into Lebanon in 1982.

54. That explains the insistence of the Lebanese Government that those who are keen on the resumption of the Naqoura talks must realize that in 1978 Lebanon experienced the trauma of a fictional withdrawal and an actual occupation. The resumption of the Naqoura talks is a desirable objective of many of the Members of the Council, as it is for the legitimate Lebanese authorities. However, because of that precedent and because of the dangers it has imposed and the prescription it gave for renewed invasion, a clearly spelled-out timetable has become an absolute necessity for a credible outcome of resumed Naqoura talks between the Lebanese and the Israelis within the framework of the United Nations.

55. Israel cannot digest the fact that every action on the part of Lebanon emerges from exercise of its sovereign prerogatives, and it persists in its argument that those who are exercising resistance in the south of Lebanon are either fanatics, religious zealots or something else. It seems that Israel cannot understand the obvious, the immediacy and spontanaeity with which any decent human being rebels against the coerciveness of occupation. Israel does not understand, as Mr. Rabin has stated—when he said the genie had been exploded—that human beings, in asserting their equality and dignity, refuse to be humiliated, that humiliation is a prescription for insurrection and revolt, and that these have been determined by all to be legitimate pursuits when occupation arrogates to itself the right to perpetuate itself.

56. Furthermore, when Israel states that it wants to withdraw in form, yet retains for itself the right to strike and "to retaliate", it means that it wants to keep the south of Lebanon hostage to its military, strategic and, if possible, political hegemony. This is an attempt on the part of Israel to persuade the international community that it seeks to withdraw from the south of Lebanon while it maintains for itself the "inherent" right to encroach on the sovereignty of Lebanon at any moment it so desires. It does so, of course, under the pretense that it is acting in self-defence.

57. I do not want to go into all the origins of this technique and this theory, which is dangerous. The Charter of the United Nations was based on the assumption that retaliation, massive and otherwise, violates international order and the prospects of international security. What is more, Israel states that it is hurt when Beirut voices concern when it is a matter that concerns Israel.

58. We must once and for all ease that hurt. Beirut is the capital of a sovereign State, Lebanon. Lebanon is a founder member of the League of Arab States. Lebanon is an Arab country. Therefore, it is part and parcel of the overall Arab commitment to the sovereignty of Arab States and to the rights of the Palestinians to self-determination. The attempt to describe Lebanon as Arab because of duress or, as the Israelis have repeatedly said, because of Syria, flies in the face of historical reality, national commitment and human decency, because Lebanon, like Syria, has contributed and will continue to contribute to the Arab national, intellectual and cultural renaissance.

59. Furthermore, any violation by Israel of Lebanon is a matter for instant reaction. It is surprising that Israel allows itself to confront the Lebanese army, as if to say that the Lebanese army is permissive towards the "terrorists". Israel does not understand the mood of the Lebanese army, the Lebanese Government and the people in the south of Lebanon. It does not perceive that the army, the Government and those people are all an integral part of a genuine national resistance.

60. The Israeli representative told the Council: "As for Israel, we do not have to justify to anyone" [*ibid., para. 78*]. That is the crux not only of a statement made in debate but of a basic attitude of mind, an ideological determination to confront anybody, any institution, any resolution, any mechanism that seeks to contain and curtail an entity that is in a state of defiance and that rejects as a matter of ideological commitment any form of accountability for any of its violations, any of its conquests, any of its acts of aggression, any of its acts of annexation.

61. "As for Israel, we do not have to justify to anyone." What does it not have to justify? The answer to that question is the documented violations and inhumane practices that the Lebanese representative has clearly spelled out, not only today but throughout the debate. Are not the questions and inquiries of the members of the Council worthy of a response from Israel? Are not they worthy of its giving an answer other than automatic rejection?

62. The statement "We do not have to justify to anyone" is dangerous because Israel is trying to establish a situation in which it becomes a loose cannon in interna-

tional relations, under international law, the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations.It is trying to put itself outside the pale of accountability that all Member States have accepted. It is trying to create a counter-legitimacy to this body's legitimacy. It is trying, in fact, to say "Take it or leave it. We are not accountable; we are not answerable."

63. The permissiveness enshrined in that attitude contains the seeds of much bigger acts of aggression, violations and threats to international peace and security. That approach is mind-boggling, especially on the part of an entity licensed by this very organization, the United Nations. In order to perpetuate its systematic, studied, ideological defiance of the international community, it uses the term "iron fist". It did not have to use the term "iron fist". We have seen the nature of its practices: the bulldozing of houses, the blowing up of people, the entry into hospitals—violation after violation, violations so frequent that one cannot cope with them.

64. When one thinks of the "iron fist" policy and the Israeli occupation, one asks by what right the Israeli army continues its presence in southern Lebanon. When practices described by everyone as violations of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949[2] are condemned, is it not time, as the representative of Lebanon asked, to take action to deter Israel and to give it an incentive to comply?

65. We are told that we must be realistic. We are told that conditions are not propitious at this moment for the United Nations to act decisively.

66. We were utterly amazed last week at what was said [*2570th meeting*] by the representative of the United States, with which Lebanon has historically maintained the closest relations ever since its independence. The two countries have the closest affinities. At this time of suffering being undergone by the Lebanese people, when scores of people in Lebanon are dying, the representative of the United States came before the Council to voice concern that would be understandable if it were part of a broader and deeper concern about Israel's practices in the south of Lebanon, the various violations that have taken place and the inhumanity of the Israeli occupation. But the representative of the United States excluded the concerns of Lebanon and the international community about what is happening in the south, and focused on three telephone calls. They were threatening, perhaps, but, however understandable that concern, I invite the representative of the United States to spend a day at one of the Arab offices in this city: she will hear some of the telephone threats that we receive at times. I am sure Member States represented in the Council have also received telephone threats.

67. Let us go further. Perhaps the United States, because of the tragedies that have taken place in Lebanon and other places, has to be even more vigilant. We can accept that. Vigilance of any country concerning its citizens is a prerogative—a matter of right and duty—and the Lebanese Government has given whatever it can give in the way of assurances and co-operation, for which the United States representative has expressed appreciation. My point is not the concern over the threats, because such concern is to be expected and is a duty. My concern is that it became almost the entire subject of the debate, almost the entire position of the United States on an issue that carries with it a great deal of concern and danger. Besides, it must be realized that the Lebanese people, as well as all other Arab peoples, has great respect for any citizen of any country working within the mechanism of the United Nations; and therefore, with due respect for the concern and with deep appreciation for such concern, we consider that it has been a digression to seek to project an entire position on a limited aspect of the concern, whether justified or not.

68. It is not for me to mention how much we appreciate the support we have received from the international community, especially that voiced here, concerning the plight of the Lebanese and of the Palestinian refugees in the camps. We would have preferred, however, that this body not be made the arena for ideological polemics with the Arab States, and we hope that the support we receive on this particular issue not be made conditional on sermonizing to the Arabs on how they should act. I should like to mention that the concern expressed in this Council over the prevalence of violence is a matter of deep and great concern for us. I think that all of us abhor violence. The sight on television every night of the removal of the twisted bodies of countless people, their faces distorted, touches the basic ethos, regardless of who they may have been, and it behooves us all to put an end to violence. It must be understood, however, that even the advocates of non-violence, such as Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King and others, described the limits of human patience to indignities, the parameters of humiliation. Non-violence is the preferred option of any resistance, but if non-violence means submissiveness to the occupier, then the violence of the occupation authorities is to be found not only in the destruction of houses, hospitals and fields or in the mutilation of bodies or in the death that is inflicted repeatedly and indiscriminately on civilian inhabitants—that is the more obvious form of violence—but when one discriminates, when one assumes and arrogates to oneself a superiority, the right to dominate, to occupy, to disqualify, to disenfranchise—that is a form of violence that strikes at the gut of every citizen and decent human being. That has been the texture of all revolutions. Therefore when the Council and the Lebanese delegation seek a halt to these acts, it is actually an investment in the future of peace, tranquillity and stability, because they are trying to defuse an unmanageable explosion of human indignity against the continued presence and defiance of Israeli occupation in southern Lebanon. Therefore objectivity is not an equidistant position between right and wrong, between the aggressor and the victims of aggression. Objectivity is measured historically by how much a position or a resolution can actually help to promote peace and effectively extirpate the seeds of violence.

69. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation was shocked to learn of the untimely passing of Mr. Konstantin Chernenko, the outstanding leader of the Soviet Party and State and Presi-

dent of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. This is a major loss to the Soviet people. We wish to convey our deep condolences to the Soviet delegation and, through the delegation, to the bereaved family.

70. Recently the Israeli authorities mobilized a large number of troops, tanks and armoured vehicles in southern Lebanon, the west Bekaa and the Rashaya district in pursuit of the so-called iron-fist policy, launched a series of raids against peaceful villages and towns and arrested and suppressed civilians, resulting in heavy casualties and the destruction of many houses.

71. We have listened attentively to the three statements by Mr. Rachid Fakhoury, the representative of Lebanon at the 2567th, 2570th and the present meeting, in which he denounced with numerous facts the recent atrocities committed by Israeli troops and the heavy losses of life and property inflicted by them on the Lebanese people. The Israeli occupying troops have thus seriously trampled underfoot the provisions contained in the 1949 Geneva Conventions.[1]

72. It must be noted that certain "chieftains" of the Israeli occupying troops have even openly asserted that they "had not exhausted all the possibilities" in their suppressive measures and that they were going to take further actions of terror. As the memories of the tragic massacre of innocent civilians in the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps in 1982 are still fresh, we cannot but worry about the recurrence of similar bloodshed.

73. By invading and prolonging their occupation of territories of Lebanon, the Israeli authorities have seriously violated the basic norms governing international relations and the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. No country whatsoever may invade neighbouring countries and forcibly occupy their territories under the pretext of ensuring its own security.

74. Israel must comply with the relevant Security Council resolutions, including the provisions of resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), and withdraw its troops from Lebanon immediately, completely and unconditionally. Under no pretext should Israel continue its occupation of southern Lebanon, pursue its "iron-fist" policy nor bully the local inhabitants. The actions taken by Israel have aggravated the situation in the region and constitute a grave threat to the peace and security of the region. This cannot but arouse the concern of the international community.

75. The Chinese delegation condemns the atrocities committed by Israel in southern Lebanon against the Lebanese people and supports the just propositions and reasonable demands put forward by the Government of Lebanon and the various demands contained in the communiqué adopted on 6 March by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries at its urgent session held in New York [*S/17008, annex*]. We hold that the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon must be respected, and that the Council should take action to check the wilful atrocities committed by Israel in the occupied Lebanese territories and make Israel implement without delay the relevant resolutions adopted by the Council and withdraw all its troops from Lebanon, so that the sacred rights of the Lebanese people to exercise sovereignty over their entire territory can be restored.

76. Mr. de KÉMOULARIA (France) (*interpretation from French*): First, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the President and my colleagues who have preceded me on the passing of President Chernenko. On my country's behalf, I extend to the representative of the Soviet Union our sincere condolences. A page of history has turned in his country. We would like him to know that we are aware of its importance and that we share in the Soviet Union's bereavement.

77. Once again the Council has met here on the request of the Lebanese Government to consider the situation in southern Lebanon. Indeed, that situation has become a matter of great concern, and it is the Council's duty immediately to give it all due attention.

78. The information that has been given us by the representative of Lebanon highlights the seriousness of these incidents, which have been growing more frequent in recent times, causing great loss of life and increasing the suffering of a population which is already sorely tried by all the events which have been taking place for years now in that region. We have continually advocated negotiation, and can only deplore acts of violence of any sort which cannot but make the search for peaceful solutions more difficult.

79. At the 2570th meeting, the United States delegation stressed that threats had been made against the United States in connection with this debate. We are surely unanimous in rejecting any form of external pressure, regardless of its nature, on one or more members of the Council that could violate the independence or the functioning of a principal body of the Organization.

80. As my predecessor stressed in the Council on 31 August 1984 [*2554th meeting*], Israel must respect international conventions on human rights which are applicable in cases of armed conflict. Like all States which have signed the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] Israel must scrupulously implement its provisions. There can be no loopholes here.

81. Armed Israeli forces—and we note this as a positive element—have begun their withdrawal. But that does not give them the right to attempt to hamper action undertaken by UNIFIL in strict application of Council resolution 523 (1982)—which, as we are all well aware, authorized the Force "to carry out . . . interim tasks in the humanitarian and administrative fields . . . and to assist the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the security of all the inhabitants of the area without any discrimination". In this respect, the Secretary-General stressed in his statement of 26 February that seven Israeli operations had recently taken place in the Force's zone of operation. We know that on several occasions there have been clashes between Israeli forces and UNIFIL elements—in particu-

lar, units supplied by my country—which were carrying out, within the framework of their instructions, a mission of peace and protection of civilian population. In our view, such incidents are deeply regrettable and contrary to the spirit in which peace-keeping operations undertaken by the Security Council should be carried out. The Council cannot allow the existence of such an attitude.

82. I take this opportunity to thank the Secretary-General for the tribute which he has paid to the dedication and actions of the French contingent.

83. It should certainly be possible to reduce the present tension considerably, thereby preventing the many resultant incidents, by returning to the negotiating table. We hope, in these circumstances, that the parties concerned will resume their talks in order to develop security arrangements which could make a real contribution to restoring calm, facilitate—indeed, hasten—the total withdrawal of Israeli forces, and finally permit a re-establishment in the region of the authority of the Lebanese Government. That would be a significant step forward in the action we are taking to help it to regain its sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity.

84. The Council knows that my Government's most ardent desire is for the establishment one day, not only in Lebanon, but throughout the region, of the lasting peace to which all the populations involved eagerly aspire.

85. Anxious to affirm its solidarity with Lebanon, which has been scourged for far too long, France—which, I repeat, wishes to see the immediate restoration of the territorial integrity and unity of that country, with which we have so many ties—while regretting that the amendments it proposed were not taken into account in the draft resolution before us [*S/17000*], which would without any question have made it possible to gain the broad support of the Council, will nevertheless vote in its favour.

86. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Democratic Yemen. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

87. Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Today, the world learned with shock of the passing of Mr. Konstantin Chernenko, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This tremendous misfortune represents a loss to the whole of mankind, which in President Chernenko lost a prominent militant who had devoted his life to the strengthening of international peace and security and to support for peoples struggling for liberation, independence and independent social and economic development. We Arab peoples will never forget President Chernenko's tireless efforts throughout his life—and especially since his assumption of the leadership of the friendly Soviet Union—to strengthen cordial Arab-Soviet relations and to provide honest support for vital Arab causes, foremost among them the cause of the Arab people of Palestine.

88. On this sad occasion we convey our most sincere condolences to Mr. Troyanovsky, representative of the Soviet Union, to all members of the Soviet Mission, and to the representatives of the Byelorussian and Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republics and all the members of their Missions. Through them, we convey our condolences to the bereaved family and to the people and Government of the friendly Soviet Union.

89. We are confident that the great Soviet people will be capable of overcoming this tragedy and of continuing its struggle, as it has always done in the past.

90. From the beginning of this debate, the Council has heard statements by the representative of Lebanon in which he adduced hard facts to describe the suffering and tragedy of the Lebanese people, chafing under the yoke of Israeli occupation and subjected to continuing escalation of the terrorist acts and practices carried out against that people by the Israeli occupation authorities, in violation of the norms of international law and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] which apply to civilians in areas under occupation. Developments in the Arab region since the Israeli invasion of Lebanese territory have shown the inability of imperialist and Zionist circles to restore colonialist hegemony to the Arab region in the face of the growing heroic resistance and valiant struggle of the Lebanese people. Lebanon has come before the Council to stress the Council's responsibility to put an end to the Israeli occupation and aggression unleased against the Lebanese people. It has made clear, frank demands, namely for an end to the Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon, for total Israeli withdrawal from Lebanese territory, for implementation of resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), unanimously adopted by the Council, for condemnation of Israel, its practices and its policies in contravention of the norms of international law and agreements, in particular the fourth Geneva Convention, and for the immediate cessation of Israeli practices and operations against the populations of southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district.

91. Israel's aggressive policies and practices aimed against the Lebanese people and against the Palestinian camps in southern Lebanon must be considered together with identical policies and practices aimed against the Palestinian Arab people and the Syrian people whose territories are under Israeli occupation in the West Bank, the Gaza district, Jerusalem and the Golan Heights. It appears that the escalation of these policies and practices follows upon the heightened threat posed by the expansionist, aggressive policies of Zionism and imperialism, which are designed to push through capitulationist schemes and to undermine legitimate Arab causes and rights, foremost among them the cause of the Palestinian Arab people and the rights of that people to return to its homeland, to self-determination, and to the establishment of an independent national State on its own national soil.

92. Under these circumstances, with the peoples of our Arab region and our vital Arab causes facing Zionist and imperialist conspiracies and schemes, the heroic resistance

of the Lebanese people against Israeli occupation—which compelled the forces of occupation to withdraw after the Lebanese people thwarted the attempted conspiracy by the American Administration to impose the so-called 17 May 1983 agreement—is a fresh example of the vigilance of the Arab peoples, their refusal to capitulate, and their continuing struggle for their just, vital causes. That resistance is added to the record of resistance of the Syrian and Palestinian peoples against occupation and of struggle for the liberation of their territories.

93. Israel regards its expansion by force and aggression, as well as its seizing and annexing territories, as one of the component elements of its very being. To this end, it enjoys unlimited American economic, political and military support. This is especially true because the Zionist-American strategic alliance affirms the real approach of American imperialism in the area and confirms its encouragement of and support for the Zionists in their occupation of more Arab territories and their denial of the rights of the Palestinian Arab peoples. This is the explanation for Israel's disregard for the Council and for international law, as well as its failure to comply with the will of the international community that an end be put to its occupation of southern Lebanon and its colonialist policies and terrorist practices in the occupied territories. Why should Israel not continue these practices when it enjoys the full protection of the exercise of the United States veto in the Security Council? This has rendered the Council unable to shoulder its responsibilities.

94. Democratic Yemen, while reiterating its solidarity with the Lebanese people in their struggle to put an end to the Israeli occupation and to preserve the unity of Lebanon and its Arab identity, regards the demands made by the representative of Lebanon as just demands, which the Council must take immediate action to implement, thereby affirming the credibility of its resolutions and its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Dare we entertain the hope that it will indeed do so?

95. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Cuba. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

96. Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to express to our colleague, Mr. Troyanovsky, and to all the members of the Soviet mission my heartfelt and deepest condolences on the passing of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, Konstantin Chernenko.

97. Mr. President, we are very pleased to see you, the representative of a worthy African country with which mine has close bonds of friendship, presiding over the deliberations of the Council this month. We are convinced that your wisdom, experience and diplomatic skills ensure that the Council will successfully carry out its work during the month of March.

98. We express our gratitude also to your predecessor, Mr. Krishnan, representative of one of our friends, India, for the very skilful and fair way in which he conducted the work of the Council in February.

99. For some time now the Council and other United Nations bodies have been considering the situation arising from Israel's criminal invasion and subsequent occupation of part of the territory of a State Member of the Organization, Lebanon, a country known historically for its peaceful traditions.

100. In spite of the many resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly, and in spite of the statements and decisions of many other international forums, particularly the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, we are once again obliged to turn to the Council for further consideration of the criminal actions that the Israeli occupation forces have been carrying out against Lebanese civilians.

101. These events have aroused the indignation of world public opinion and have been vigorously condemned by the Member States that cherish peace and justice.

102. In this connection, my Government's position has been set forth in a statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which, with your permission and that of the other members of the Council, I shall now read out:

> "Reports from Lebanon inform us about genocidal acts that have been carried out by Zionist occupation troops of Israel against the people of southern Lebanon. We received information daily about the establishment of curfews, the destruction of the homes of peaceful inhabitants, the detention of inhabitants in concentration camps, indiscriminate attacks by artillery, aircraft and troops against civilians, and the unleashing of brutal repression against the inhabitants of the region of southern Lebanon.
>
> "These criminal actions are an alarming indication that the Zionists are planning to perpetuate their control over this part of Lebanon and to create a 'buffer State', as originally envisaged in their plans for the invasion known as 'Peace for Galilee' launched in June 1982.
>
> "The continued pressure exerted on the occupation forces by the resistance of the patriotic and progressive Lebanese forces has obliged Israel to carry out partial withdrawals. The strength of the patriotic resistance has stymied the Israeli army, which has engaged in reprisals, terrorizing and killing civilians.
>
> "Once again the Israeli Government, with the support of its strategic ally, the United States, is showing its complete scorn for the most elementary rules of international life, brazenly and openly infringing the rights of the Lebanese people, flagrantly violating the Charter of the United Nations and all the resolutions of the Security Council, which require immediate and unconditional withdrawal from the occupied Lebanese territories, and once again trampling underfoot Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

"This escalation of aggression greatly increases the danger that another war will break out in the region, placing international peace and security at risk.

"The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Cuba vigorously condemns these crimes against humanity committed by the Zionist occupation forces and calls the attention of world public opinion to the overriding necessity of stopping these reprehensible actions and preventing Israel from slaughtering with impunity the courageous and heroic Lebanese and their legitimate patriotic resistance."

103. Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The people of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, like all the peoples of the Soviet Union, profoundly regret the passing away of Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The name of that outstanding figure of the Communist Party and of the Soviet State will remain forever enshrined in the memory of our people. The entire life and activities of Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko were dedicated to serving the interests of the Soviet people, to resolving major economic and social problems in the development of the country and to advancing the struggle for ending the arms race and eliminating the threat of nuclear war in order to ensure the security of peoples.

104. The Ukrainian delegation shares the concern regarding the continuing tragedy in southern Lebanon, which has been occupied by the Israeli military clique. The facts cited in the statements of the representative of Lebanon and the alarming information in the reports received daily from the area attest to the extremely dangerous situation in the occupied southern part of the country and reaffirm how right the Government of that country was to turn to the Council for help.

105. The Ukrainian people languished under the yoke of Hitlerite occupation for a number of years and had to endure all the ensuing terrible consequences. Our people, like all the brotherly peoples of the Soviet Union which bore the burdens of deprivation and suffering of the Second World War, and which made a decisive contribution to defeating Hitlerite fascism and to achieving a historic victory—of which the fortieth anniversary will be widely celebrated in May by all progressive mankind—shares in and understands the suffering of the Lebanese and other Arab peoples in the continuing occupation of their ancestral lands.

106. For almost three years now, the Israeli military clique has been committing abuses on part of Lebanese territory occupied as a result of the aggression of 1982. Since that time, the wave of terror and violence directed at the Lebanese and Palestinians has for all practical purposes not slackened for a single day. By mobilizing infantry and tank units to carry out punitive operations, the Israeli invaders have blockaded towns and villages, carrying out general searches, round-ups and arrests, subjecting peaceful civilians to humiliations, torture, indignities and beatings. During recent days, the scale of mass punitive operations has become particularly cruel, and their extent has once again been pointed out today in the statement of the representative of Lebanon.

107. Numerous facts cited during meetings of the Council with absolute clarity attest to the crude violation by Israel, the occupying Power, of the relevant norms of international humanitarian law, the Charter of the United Nations and the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] and the Regulations annexed to the Hague Convention IV respecting the laws and customs of war on land, of 1907.[3] These actions are in violation of the relevant decisions of the Council, in particular of the unanimously adopted resolutions 512 (1982) and 513 (1982).

108. There can be no doubt that the aggressor would not behave so insolently and provocatively were it not for the comprehensive assistance and support of the United States.

109. Suffice it to recall that on 6 September 1984 [*2556th meeting*], the United States blocked the adoption by the Council of a draft resolution [*S/16732*] which, in view of the existing serious situation, represented the bare minimum, calling as it did on Israel to comply strictly with the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 *vis-à-vis* the civilian population of southern Lebanon.

110. Those same forces are to blame for the fact that Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which were adopted with their participation, remain unimplemented—the latter demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli forces to the internationally recognized borders of Lebanon, a most important prerequisite for a settlement of the situation in Lebanon.

111. Firmly condemning the continuing Israeli occupation of the territory of Lebanon and the most recent wave of terror and acts of oppression directed against the civilian population in southern Lebanon, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic believes that the Council must condemn the abuses of the Israeli occupiers, demand an immediate unconditional and total withdrawal of Israeli troops from that country in accordance with its resolution 509 (1982), and ensure compliance by the aggressor with the norms of international humanitarian law regarding the civilian population of the occupied territory. It is necessary to ensure respect for the territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon and to put an end to the arbitrary will and violence of the Israeli occupiers concerning the civilian population, including the Palestinian refugees in the camps. A demand for the immediate implementation of these measures is also made in the communiqué adopted on 6 March 1985 by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at its urgent session, held in New York [*S/17008, annex*].

112. As to the concern expressed in the Council over Israel's activities with regard to UNIFIL, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR supports the proposal made in the

course of the current debate to have the Secretary-General regularly inform the Council with regard to all cases where there are obstacles to United Nations forces carrying out their functions in that area.

113. It is perfectly obvious that consideration of the Lebanese problem in isolation from the general explosive situation in the Middle East is impossible. In this connection, we fully support the proposals made on 29 July 1984 by the Soviet Union concerning a Middle East settlement [*S/16685, annex*] as the basis for the search for a comprehensive and just settlement ensuring peace and security for all States and peoples of the region.

114. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR supports the draft resolution sponsored by Lebanon in document S/17000.

115. Mr. LUNA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I should like to extend to the people and the Government of the Soviet Union the heartfelt condolences of the Government of Peru on the decease of Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

116. In the current debate which has led to the convening of the Council for the second time in the past six months as a result of new complaints by Lebanon concerning events affecting the civilian population in southern Lebanon, the delegation of Peru would like at the outset to express its sincere and profound solidarity with Lebanon, which has long been the victim of circumstances and events representing not only a tragedy but also outrageous and cruel abuse of a State Member of the United Nations, a country whose efforts and undeniable valour my country much admires and respects.

117. As the Secretary-General warned some time ago, the situation has now worsened significantly and reached levels going beyond the survival, the dignity and the respect for the human rights of the inhabitants of the region and the minimum requirements for the peace and security of the area.

118. As it has already stated, my delegation confirms its determined support for Lebanon in these serious circumstances. We hope that, with the support of the other members of the Council, a way will soon be found leading to the immediate restoration to the people and the Government of Lebanon of their right to real independence and sovereignty, and consequently, to the full exercise of authority throughout their territory, thus guaranteeing the preservation of their integrity and unity. I therefore wish to reaffirm our support for the resolutions adopted by the Council on this subject, specifically resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982).

119. Within the general framework of our moral and legal obligations, I wish to state that for Peru it is a matter of the greatest priority at this time that we should develop the precarious machinery for a dialogue between the parties and work for the effective and speedy resumption of contacts between the military authorities in order to complete the withdrawal process already under way, so as effectively to guarantee the human rights of the civilian population in keeping with the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[2] If this is not attained—and it cannot fail to be an aim shared by the international community—the present critical situation could worsen even more radically, jeopardizing any potential *rapprochement* or initiative aimed at disentangling the complex situation in the Middle East.

120. The draft resolution before us [*S/17000*] refers to the situation in which the civilian population of southern Lebanon finds itself. For practical and constructive reasons we would have preferred the text to have referred more clearly to the objective of finding, even now, the minimal machinery to stabilize and systematize the process of withdrawal of the occupying forces. We sincerely believe that if there had been a specific reference to this subject, the text would have been less narrow and the situation could have become less dramatic and violent than it is at present.

121. As regards certain aspects of the drafting of the text, my delegation believes that, although in this specific case we have not heard any denial of the complaints made by Lebanon, condemnations should be in keeping with facts that are suitably corroborated at the international level.

122. On the other hand, I cannot fail to state most clearly that my Government has noted the concern voiced by the representative of the United States [*2570th meeting*] with regard to blackmail by certain obscure extremist groups, in a crude attempt to influence that country's vote on the current problem. In so far as that raises pressure and violence to unheard of dimensions in this now nearly anarchic international system, and is an attempt to bring terrorism into this principal mechanism for collective security of the international community, it is the duty of each State individually and of the United Nations as a whole to reject that attempt categorically.

123. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now speak in my capacity as the representative of MADAGASCAR.

124. On the occasion of the death of President Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko, I wish officially to reiterate the profound condolences of my delegation to the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to read out the message sent by Mr. Didier Ratsiraka, the President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as follows:

> "It is with great regret that the Malagasy people, the institutions of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar and I myself learned the sad news of the death of President Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. I therefore wish to express our sincerest condolences on the cruel

loss of this eminent Soviet statesman, Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. His work has come to an end at a crucial time for the future of peace in the world and at a time of great distress for the third world. History will long remember him as a man of principle who, throughout his life, constantly worked to bring peoples together, to achieve equitable international co-operation and above all to safeguard the fragile edifice of peace."

That message fully reflects the feelings of my delegation at this time.

125. Resuming consideration of the item on the agenda, I wish to make the following statement.

126. It is difficult to give a more faithful, more convincing and more moving account of Israeli actions in southern Lebanon, the region of the western Bekaa and the district of Rashaya than was done by the representative of Lebanon in his statements before the Council on 28 February and 7 March [*2568th and 2570th meetings*] and today. Everything, or almost everything, has already been said about sweeps, encircling operations, meticulous investigations, house-by-house searches, destruction, the placing of plastic explosives, the desecration of houses of worship, the rounding up of people, massacres and the brutal, humiliating and inhuman treatment meted out to the Lebanese civilian population by the Israeli armed forces.

127. Powerless, or perhaps indifferent, we hear the long list of names of villages such as Aaichiye, Arab Salim, Bazuriyah, Burj-Rahhal, Ma'rakeh, Rihane, Qusayeh, Sir El-Gharbiyah, Shaqra, Kfa-Dounin, Qabrikha, Taura, Jib Jannin, Kamid Al-Loz, Tair Dibbah, Deir Mimas, Kfar Kila, Qar'oon, Deir Kanoun, El-Nahr and many more, without really appreciating the horrors experienced by the population under the iron rod of Tsahal.

128. And yet this is not deceitful or ill-intentioned propaganda. Reporters from *The Washington Post* and ABC radio have borne witness to it. Western observers have reported on it. Members of relief organizations and of UNIFIL have confirmed it. Some of them, French and Finnish, have been accused of wanting to impede Tsahal's action against what people have conveniently called terrorists. The area occupied by Israel has become a real battlefield—for an unequal battle between civilian populations and highly trained and over-armed occupiers—and the international community is denied the right to condemn this and to demand its immediate cessation.

129. In the circumstances, Israel puts forward three arguments: the first is that it will not hesitate to resort to the most extreme methods to protect its soldiers' lives; the second, that it cannot be held responsible for dissent among Lebanese communities; and the third, that it is only a question of Shiite terrorists. It does this in the hope of reconciling certain opinions whose connivance with neo-nazism and neo-fascism is all too familiar.

130. Thus only the lives of the soldiers in the Tsahal count, and we must now forget the obligations of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[2] But what about its article 27, which prohibits physical and moral assaults upon civilians in occupied territories? What about article 30, which gives all facilities to civilian populations, enabling them to turn to the International Committee of the Red Cross for assistance? And what about article 31, banning any physical or moral coercion of civilians to obtain information from them? What of article 53, forbidding the destruction of personal and real property belonging individually or collectively to individuals in occupied territory? What of article 55, according to which the occupying Power has the duty of ensuring the provision of food and medical supplies of the population? And finally, what about article 29, according to which the occupying Power is held fully responsible for any mistreatment of local populations by its armed forces? We do not believe that the repeated, systematic and flagrant violation of these articles constitutes self-defence.

131. The Israeli occupier has given its armed forces *carte blanche* to oppress and repress the nationalists whose duty is to oppose the occupation by all means. We have heard here reports from many delegations as to the meaning of the resistance. Israel knew full well that the Shiite opposition in that area has always been very strong, so strong that it called the arc of resistance "villages of hate". But what can be expected from populations that are victims of unlawful occupation, therefore of aggression? Must they applaud? Must they collaborate? Must they allow themselves to be manipulated by those who are at the orders and in the pay of the occupiers? In voting unanimously in favour of resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), we all recognized that Israel's occupation of part of Lebanon was illegal, and those of us who have had the sorry experience of occupation will surely agree that resistance is legitimate, and that the origin of the cycle of violence must be sought elsewhere than in Lebanese resistance.

132. Turning now to the argument that any Israeli operation in Lebanon is in one way or another linked to the security of the Israeli populations on the border, we would remind the Council that according to international law the protection of the civilian population of a State takes place within the boundaries of that State, and that no country can, under that pretext, invade another country or interfere in another country's internal affairs. Israel's "iron fist" policy, instead of suppressing resistance, has only encouraged it, and certain circles say that this could provoke the Shiite resistance to shoot at villages in Galilee and to justify the maintainance of Tsahal beyond the internationally recognized borders of Lebanon.

133. Thus we arrive at this paradox: that Lebanon, and in particular the civilian populations of southern Lebanon, in western Bekaa and the Rashaya district, have basically become victims of the controversy in Israeli political circles between those favouring total withdrawal and those who, grudgingly, have accepted a phased redeployment.

134. Our conclusions, which concur with those put forward in the communiqué adopted on 6 March by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned

Countries at its urgent meeting in New York [*S/17008, annex*] are as follows.

135. Israel has deliberately placed itself outside international law and has engaged in reprehensible acts in occupied Lebanese territory.

136. Lebanon, regardless of the regional political context, was right in bringing the question to the Council and demanding that justice be done, as is called for in the draft resolution in document S/17000.

137. After our adoption of resolutions 425 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), we have an obligation to condemn Israel's present practices in occupied Lebanese territory and to demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel's occupying forces from Lebanon. Otherwise it will be vain to speak of strict respect for the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of that Member State.

138. I now resume my functions as PRESIDENT.

139. The next speaker is the representative of Jordan. I invite him to take a place as the Council table and to make his statement.

140. Mr. KASRAWI (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the outset I should like to convey to the Soviet delegation our profound condolences on the occasion of the death of President Konstantin Chernenko, President of the Supreme Soviet and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We share the general distress at the loss of one of the champions of international détente and of *rapprochement*. We should be grateful if our condolences could be forwarded to the Government and people of that friendly country the Soviet Union and to the bereaved family.

141. The Council is meeting to resume its discussion of Lebanon's complaint against Israel, which is justified by the tyranny, high-handedness and brutality of the Israeli occupation forces, which commit daily—with impunity—arbitrary actions and oppressive practices against the civilian population of the areas under Israeli occupation. The representative of Lebanon has sketched in the Council, with considerable supporting evidence, a tragic picture of the great hardship and suffering inflicted on the Lebanese population, which, under the heel of the Israeli occupation, has suffered a whole range of atrocities, including arrests, murder, humiliation, mass punishment, the encircling of villages and towns by the Israeli army and indiscriminate firing upon the people and their houses.

142. Each day the violence reaches new peaks, even to the point where places of worship and hospitals are not safe, despite their inviolability enshrined in all international norms and conventions. Since the meeting of the Council on 28 February [*2568th meeting*], the Israeli arbitrary actions have been intensified. Members of the Council have become aware of the details of those actions, thanks to the letters from the representative of Lebanon, particularly that of 4 March [*S/16997*], which describes an example of Israel's repressive policy in the town of Ma'rakah. Israeli forces surrounded and raided this town, where they blew up its mosque, with 15 people killed and 45 wounded, and blasted four houses.

143. The latest of these repressive acts was committed on this very day, when Israeli forces raided the village of Al-Zararich in southern Lebanon, with the result that 24 people were killed.

144. The Israeli policy of collective punishment of the civilian population of the occupied Lebanese regions is merely an extension of the policy pursued by the occupying forces in the West Bank, Gaza and the Golan Heights ever since they occupied those territories in 1967. The Israeli military forces have committed those actions against the civilian population only because those populations resist the occupation. The world recently witnessed an intensification of that policy in occupied southern Lebanon, to the point where the only choice for Lebanon, which has endured intolerable sufferings, was recourse to the Council, in the hope that the Council could find a way to deter Israel from continuing its campaign of repression against the Lebanese people.

145. Israel has harboured a perception of its security founded on the use of force that can extend to the territory of neighbouring States and, where necessary, the occupation of those territories, believing that such acts can assure Israeli security. However, Israel has forgotten that the denial of other people's rights and the occupation of their territories which accompanies application of that perception leads to fierce resistance and rejection of its policy and its occupation.

146. The Lebanese experience has made it clear that that special theory of security has been a failure. Its implementation in Lebanon has cost Israel dear; it has led to the absence of a just and lasting peace in the region. The Council has again affirmed that Israel must withdraw from Lebanon and has called for complete and unconditional withdrawal from all the occupied Lebanese territories, as set out in its resolution 509 (1982). Israel has trampled underfoot the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] which forbids occupying forces to carry out policies of terrorization, retaliation and collective punishment of the population, such policies have impelled Lebanon to have recourse to the Council, asking it to take measures to stop those acts of brutality against the civilian population and to compel Israel to implement Council resolutions calling for its complete withdrawal from occupied territories.

147. Lebanon's request is perfectly just. Lebanon is thereby attempting to restore its sovereignty over all its territory and to put an end to all those practices which so gravely endanger its sovereignty and security. The inhabitants of the country, whether Lebanese or Palestinian, have endured more hardship than anyone in the world. The Lebanese request is in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations resolutions on Lebanon previously adopted by the Council. It is incumbent on the Council to

do its moral and political duty in response to the just and legitimate Lebanese requests.

148. Events that have taken place since the Lebanese complaint have confirmed the importance of the statement made by the representative of Lebanon on 28 February, in which he said:

> "Israeli military operations and inhumane practices in the regions still under Israeli occupation are daily becoming more severe and more violent, and now call for speedy and urgent action by the Council, to which we have come today with a legitimate complaint based on undeniable and irrefutable facts and evidence. To seek to justify or excuse those actions will not do any good whatever." [*2568th meeting, para.18.*]

149. The arguments adduced by Israel to justify its tyranny in southern Lebanon result from the continuation of its occupation of Lebanese territory and from its practices. We should, therefore, not be surprised if that occupation has led to a stiffening of Lebanese resistance. The resistance that Israel is encountering in southern Lebanon is only a normal reaction to its own use of force and its occupation.

150. The only solution for southern Lebanon is a withdrawal by the Israeli forces from all the recently occupied Lebanese territories, not recourse to repression, which has proved powerless to bring the Lebanese people to its knees.

151. What is happening in Lebanon proves an essential truth—that in the face of foreign occupation the only solution is withdrawal of the foreign forces, because there is no justification for such occupation, whatever pretexts are adduced.

152. The situation in southern Lebanon which is now before the Council has come about because of the Council's inability to implement the resolutions that it adopted after the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982, at a time when it demanded that Israel withdraw from all occupied Lebanese territories. In the past three years those resolutions have led to no international measures capable of securing their enforcement. This has been interpreted by certain warlike States as a green light justifying their imposing their will on small States, which in consequence lose confidence in the future of a world action based on the concepts and principles on which the United Nations was founded.

153. The Council has special responsibility in regard to Lebanon and its just requests. How can that responsibility be shouldered, except by acceding to the Lebanese requests, foremost among which is condemning and stopping Israeli practices, compelling Israel to respect and to apply the terms of the fourth Geneva Convention and to withdraw completely and unconditionally from the occupied territories on the basis of resolutions 425 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), and compelling it to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon?

154. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the German Democratic Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

155. Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): It is with deep sorrow that the delegation of the German Democratic Republic has learned of the decease of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. Together with the fraternal Soviet people, we mourn the death of a great statesman whose life and work were dedicated to the welfare of the Soviet Union and to the happiness of all people in the world. His name remains inseparably linked with the struggle for the preservation of peace and for friendship and understanding among peoples. His initiatives have contributed greatly to the activities of the Organization. The people of the German Democratic Republic has lost a good friend in Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. We wish to express to the delegation of the Soviet Union, and especially to you, Comrade Oleg Troyanovsky, and through you to the family of Konstantin Chernenko and to all Soviet comrades and friends, our heartfelt condolences.

156. Speaking today before the Council, I am pleased to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for this month. My delegation wishes you every success in the tasks facing the Council.

157. I wish also to join previous speakers in expressing thanks to the representative of India, Mr. Krishnan, for his wise conduct of the proceedings of the Council last month.

158. Since this is the first time this year that my delegation is speaking before the Council, I should like to congratulate the representatives of Australia, Denmark, Madagascar, Thailand and Trinidad and Tobago as new members of the Council and to wish them much success.

159. The Council has repeatedly had reason to deal with the occupation of Arab territories by Israel, in opposition to international law and with violations of human rights. This time it is dealing with crimes committed against the civilian population of southern Lebanon.

160. The representative of Lebanon gave a detailed report before the Council on the extent of the excesses and practices of the Israeli occupation troops.

161. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic shares the view of many representatives who have pointed out the causes of the aggravated situation in southern Lebanon.

162. Thus, the events in southern Lebanon demonstrate again the arrogant way in which the ruling circles of Israel disregard world public opinion and trample upon United Nations resolutions, in particular resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) of the Council. They would not act in such

a way were it not for the support given by well-known imperialist circles.

163. Present developments in that region again show that the ruling Israeli circles, encouraged by the assistance from their allies, despite various manoeuvres are not willing to abandon their policy of aggression and occupation. Rather, they are interested in maintaining the Middle East as an area of tension, as was demonstrated by recent events reflecting the imperialist policy of power. The brutal acts committed by the occupation troops against the civilian population in southern Lebanon which were characterized by various representatives here as a policy of "the iron fist" cannot therefore be considered in isolation from the entire situation in the region.

164. They underline anew that it is imperative to bring about a comprehensive solution of the Middle East conflict on the basis of United Nations resolutions demanding the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, as well as the implementation of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, including its right to establish a State of its own.

165. The German Democratic Republic supports the demand of the overwhelming majority of States for the convening of an international Middle East peace conference with the participation of all sides concerned, including the PLO. The convocation of such a conference would foster a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict and thus secure peace in that region.

166. Aligning itself with the position expressed in the communiqué adopted on 6 March by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at its urgent meeting, held in New York, concerning the situation in the areas occupied by Israel in southern Lebanon [*S/17008, annex*], the German Democratic Republic resolutely condemns the latest Israeli acts of terror and demands their immediate cessation. It shares the view of those States that it is imperative to implement Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) and to bring about the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel in order to restore the unity, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

167. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the United Arab Emirates. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

168. Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It was with deep sorrow that we received the news this morning of the death of the Soviet President, Konstantin Chernenko. On this occasion and in the name of the delegation of the United Arab Emirates, I extend our deepest condolences to the Soviet delegation. We hope that it will transmit them to the bereaved family and to the Government and people of the Soviet Union.

169. I have the honour, in the name of the delegation of the United Arab Emirates, to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for this month. We are certain that, with your well-known competence and your long experience in the Organization, you will conduct the work of the Council efficiently and objectively.

170. I also wish to express our appreciation and admiration on the ideal way in which the representative of India conducted the work of the Council last month.

171. I do not wish to repeat the details contained in the statement made by the representative of Lebanon when he addressed the Council on 28 February [*2568th meeting*] and at previous meetings, concerning Israeli arbitrary practices and the many kinds of torture, oppression and displacement to which the civilians of southern Lebanon have been subjected. The news of such practices is daily reported by the mass media; however, I should like to take up some points in this regard.

172. First, the Israeli acts of aggression against Lebanon and the continued Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon for more than two years are themselves flagrant violations of international law and a clear crime against humanity. We believe that the continued occupation, with all the ensuing practices, is the crux of the problem. Therefore, the termination of Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon and withdrawal of the Zionist invasion forces to the international borders constitute the main task of the Council. Without the fulfilment of that task, it would be difficult for us to imagine peace and stability being restored to Lebanon, in particular southern Lebanon. On that basis, we reiterate what we have already said frequently, namely, the need to implement Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), the latter calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel to the internationally recognized boundaries. Furthermore, we believe that the current situation and current Israeli practices in southern Lebanon are but a direct result of the non-implementation of those resolutions.

173. My second point is that the obstacles placed in the way of the Council and preventing it from adopting a resolution at its last series of meetings, in September last year [*2552nd to 2556th meetings*]—owing to some of its members—contributed to the increased tension and strengthened Israel in its arbitrary practices against the civilian population. The people in southern Lebanon then lost hope that the Council would do them justice, and that has led them to take measures to defend themselves and their territory and to retaliate with violence against Israeli violence. If the language of violence is the only one that Israel understands, the Lebanese national resistance in all its dimensions represents the rejection by the Lebanese people of occupation and its readiness to sacrifice martyrs in defence of its land and dignity.

174. Therefore the struggle of the Lebanese national resistance against the Israeli occupation authorities is not just an absolute right to that resistance; it is also a national duty founded on the experience of many peoples in their liberation wars against foreign occupation and invasion and confirmed by the right of peoples to live in peace and

freedom. Moreover, this resistance is sanctioned by numerous United Nations resolutions.

175. In the light of the well-known Israeli policies, we must recall that the Lebanese national resistance has been the prime mover behind Israel's declared intention to pull out of Lebanon. In view of the complex circumstances here in the Council and in the Lebanese territories, there is no other element that could compel Israel to commit itself to that declaration but the continued resistance against the Israeli forces.

176. On that basis, the United Arab Emirates welcomes the Lebanese national resistance struggle and holds it in high esteem. It reaffirms its support to the fraternal Lebanese people in its just struggle to regain its freedom, liberate its territory and restore its sovereignty over all its territories.

177. I now come to my third point. We have listened with deep concern to some statements in support of not adopting a resolution that would condemn Israeli practices, and invoking various pretexts such as Israel's intention to pull out and the danger that some interests would face. We believe that those pretexts have but one objective: to put pressure on the members of the Council. They can be understood only within the framework of the policies that their supporters and advocates pursue in their support of the expansionist and terrorist Israeli practices. Therefore we reject those pretexts and believe that prevarication about the Council's adopting the draft resolution [*S/17000*] threatens the lives of more Lebanese civilians.

178. Every day the people of southern Lebanon are subjected to more arbitrary practices, more collective killings, more demolition of houses and more organized oppression. Clear evidence of that is the massacre perpetrated by the Israeli occupation forces in the village of Ma'rakah only a few days after the Council had started its discussion on this item. The continued daily massacres are hard evidence of the fact that Israel flouts international legitimacy because of the protection it enjoys through the American veto.

179. In order for the Council to fulfil its responsibility towards international peace and security and the prevention of aggression and to reaffirm its credibility so that helpless States will not lose confidence in it and the United Nations in general, and on the basis of the complaints in numerous letters addressed by Lebanon to the Council and the Secretary-General, we appeal to all the members of the Council to help Lebanon regain sovereignty over its national soil, to stop the bloodshed on its territory and to put an end to the Israeli practices on Lebanese territory by voting in favour of the draft resolution submitted to this Council by Lebanon.

180. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Bangladesh. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

181. Mr. WASIUDDIN (Bangladesh): I should like at the outset to express our profound shock and grief at the sudden demise of Mr. Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. On behalf of the members of my Mission and on my own behalf, I should like to convey our sincere and heartfelt condolences to the representative of the Soviet Union, the members of his Mission and the bereaved family on their great national loss.

182. Since the Bangladesh delegation is participating for the first time this year in a Council meeting, I shall begin my statement by expressing our warm felicitations to you, Sir, on the election of your great country to the Council and also on your assumption of the presidency for the current month. We are confident that the deliberations of the Council will immensely benefit from your vast experience and proven diplomatic skill.

183. Let me take this opportunity also, Sir, to convey our deep appreciation to your predecessor, Mr. Natarajan Krishnan, representative of India, for the exemplary manner in which he guided the work of the Council during the month of February.

184. The Council is again seized of a crisis threatening international peace and security, arising out of the latest Israeli operations and inhumane practices against the civilian population in the Lebanese territories occupied by Israel. These incidents are by no means isolated events of repression, but constitute yet another link in the long chain of Israel's policies of relentless expansion, occupation and unabated aggression against its Arab neighbours.

185. The representative of Lebanon, in his statements made to the Council at the 2568th meeting on 28 February, the 2570th meeting on 7 March and today, has already given a graphic description of the coercive methods and abusive practices employed by Israel against the civilian population in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district. The international press and other news media have also given us a vivid picture of the suffering of the Lebanese civilian population in the occupied territories.

186. Their villages and towns have been seized, their homes have been demolished, and they have been subjected to indiscriminate killing, detention, kidnapping, repression and humiliation. Only last week, a huge bomb exploded in a mosque in the village of Ma'rakah in southern Lebanon, killing at least 15 people. It is abundantly clear that the Israeli forces, which had earlier seized the town, are directly responsible for the incident. Bangladesh and the entire Islamic world received this news with deep shock and indignation.

187. The recent Israeli actions in southern Lebanon and in other occupied territories are clearly in violation of the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949[2] and the norms of international law

They are also clearly intended to intimidate and terrorize the civilian population in the occupied territories. But the heroic Lebanese fighters have demonstrated once again that they cannot be suppressed or silenced.

188. The position of Bangladesh on the question of Lebanon has been firm and consistent. We have expressed in the strongest terms our condemnation of Israeli aggression against Lebanon and have reaffirmed our total and unflinching solidarity with our Lebanese brethren. My Government has repeatedly called for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon. We have also reiterated our unequivocal support to our Lebanese brethren in the achievement of national reconciliation and in preservation of the independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

189. The question of Lebanon, however, should not be viewed in isolation, as it constitutes an integral part of the overall Middle East question. In other words, any solution of the problem of Lebanon cannot be separated from a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The firm and unequivocal position of Bangladesh on the question of the Middle East has been based on our firm belief in the principles and purposes of the Charter and on our enduring commitment to the cause of oppressed peoples all over the world struggling to free themselves from the bondage of colonialism, aggression and exploitation, peoples committed to establishing their inalienable right to self-determination, national freedom and political independence.

190. Bangladesh views the essentials of any meaningful peace plan for the Middle East as a composite whole, a comprehensive settlement, every part thereof being integrally related to the other. We are firmly convinced that there cannot be any lasting peace in the region without a total withdrawal of Israeli forces from all occupied Arab and Palestinian territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and without the restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to an independent State of their own. It is equally essential that the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, participate in any peace process on an equal footing. Any comprehensive plan must include these essential elements to restore just and lasting peace to the region.

191. The developments in the Middle East over nearly decades have demonstrated beyond any shadow of doubt that the complex problem of the Middle East cannot be solved by a few countries or by a major Power and its allies. The situation clearly calls for an international effort under the aegis of the United Nations to ensure that the interests and rights of all the parties concerned are met in a fully impartial and rational manner, with a view to evolving a just, viable and lasting settlement of the problem.

192. It is in this context that Bangladesh supported the proposal for the early convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East. The Arab peace plan, which my delegation has fully supported as a sound basis for the restoration of peace in the region, is already before the international community [*see S/15510, annex*]. In recent weeks, we have noted with interest that a number of concrete proposals have been made to initiate the peace process in the region. Israel, on the other hand, has further aggravated the situation in the region through its policy of terror and harassment in the occupied territories, with a view to obstructing the initiation of the peace process in the Middle East.

193. The failure of the Council in the past to act firmly and decisively has only encouraged Israel to intensify its aggression and barbarity. In the present circumstances, it is imperative that the Council proceed urgently, with all the authority and resources at its disposal, to avert a further blood-bath in southern Lebanon and other occupied territories and to secure the implementation of its own resolutions, particularly resolutions 425 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), in order to ensure Israel's immediate and unconditional withdrawal from the Lebanese territories to the internationally recognized boundaries.

194. The latest Israeli actions and measures are in clear violation of the fourth Geneva Convention and other norms of international law. Israel, the occupying Power, must be asked to desist forthwith from its illegal and abusive practices against the civilian population in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district, and to restore normal conditions in those areas. The situation in the region should also be kept under constant review, and the Secretary-General should be entrusted with reporting to the Council on the implementation of its resolutions.

195. In conclusion, let me thank the members of the Council for giving us this opportunity to take part in the current debate.

196. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Viet Nam. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

197. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): First, on behalf of the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, I extend to Comrade Oleg Troyanovsky and the delegations of the Soviet Union, the Byelorussian SSR and the Ukrainian SSR our deepest condolences on the death of Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Communist Party and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, an outstanding leader of the Soviet people and a great friend of the Vietnamese people. The death of President Chernenko is a cruel loss indeed, not only for the Soviet Union but also for the cause of friendship and understanding among peoples and peace in the world. I request the delegation of the Soviet Union to transmit to the Communist Party, the Government and the people of the Soviet Union and to the bereaved family our deepest feelings of fraternal sympathy.

[*The speaker continued in English.*]

198. Now, Sir, allow me to congratulate you warmly on your assumption of the presidency for this month. We are

confident that with your talents, your diplomatic skill and your long experience at the United Nations, you will guide the work of the Council to success.

199. I should like also to congratulate Mr. Krishnan, representative of India, on his efforts to fulfil his responsibility as President for the month of February.

200. Our participation today in a meeting of the Council for the first time in 1985 gives us a chance to welcome the new members of the Council and to thank all the members of the Council for giving us this opportunity to speak.

201. The entire world has been filled with shock and indignation at the new horrendous crimes committed by Israeli aggressors in the occupied areas in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district. If the aggressions committed by Israel against Lebanon in 1978 and 1982 showed the true colours of the aggressors, then these new crimes serve as further proof of what they actually are, as they retreat. In order to extricate itself from its economic difficulties and to avoid military defeat, Israel finally has to withdraw from Lebanon. Yet the so-called three-stage withdrawal plan has not been drawn up in good faith; it is simply a ploy to hoodwink public opinion.

202. First, Israel unilaterally cancelled the talks with the Government of Lebanon concerning the recovery of Lebanon's sovereignty over the areas from which Israeli troops are withdrawing. Secondly, Israel still reserves the right not only to teach Lebanon another lesson but also to come back whenever it likes; and, thirdly, it has obviously been trying to prepare the soil for sowing the seeds of Israeli-chosen henchmen, with the ultimate objective of "invisible Israel's occupation of Lebanon". To facilitate this, Israel is stepping up its suppression of the people opposing its occupation, and this has resulted in the killing or wounding of hundreds of innocent persons. These new acts are reminiscent of the genocide-like killings in Sabra and Shatila, so vehemently denounced and condemned throughout the world. We shall not yield to the temptation to cite all the specific cases set forth in document S/16974 and S/16974/Add.1.

203. What is even more grave is that while the representative of Lebanon, with a sinking heart, was submitting the case before the Council and while the Council was seriously considering it, Israel was committing more and more crimes. They have been described in detail by many previous speakers. Nothing can justify Israel's acts of genocide against innocent people in Lebanon or elsewhere in the areas it occupies; nor can anything save it from defeat—no matter how large the assistance given to it by its most powerful strategic ally is, or will be.

204. We resolutely demand that Israel put an immediate end to its abusive practices and its massacre of people in Lebanon, and that it respect the resolutions on the subject adopted so far by the Council and the rules and principles of international law, particularly the relevant provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[2] Israel must withdraw its troops from Lebanon without any conditions and with strict respect for Lebanon's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity; it must resume the talks with Lebanon so as to work out ways and means to ensure the latter's takeover.

205. My delegation fully supports Lebanon in its genuine efforts to recover its sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity. In this spirit, my delegation fully supports the communiqué adopted on 6 March by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at its urgent meeting, held in New York [*S/17008, annex*] and which the representative of India presented to the Council at its 2570th meeting. My delegation also strongly supports the just demands of Lebanon as contained in draft resolution S/17000, now before the Council. Furthermore, my delegation earnestly urges the Council to take appropriate measures to ensure the full implementation by Israel of all the Council's relevant resolutions.

206. The present developments in Lebanon are only part of the complicated situation in the Middle East. This situation can be solved only through a comprehensive peaceful settlement that guarantees the exercise of the right to self-determination by the Palestinian people and respect for the legitimate interests of all countries in the region, including an independent State of Palestine. Such a solution can be achieved only within the framework of an international conference on the Middle East. This is in complete conformity with the position taken by the United Nations and by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

207. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

208. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): We have learned with grief and distress of the passing away of Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union. His death is a great loss to all mankind. Great peoples produce great leaders. The pursuit of peace has been the corner-stone of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. We are certain that the Soviet Union will pursue its goal of attaining peace in the world, and in particular in our area—peace through a just solution to the question of Palestine conducive to a comprehensive and just solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, peace to be achieved within the framework of an international peace conference on the Middle East held under the auspices of the United Nations. We wish to express our condolences to the Soviet peoples and to our colleagues in the Mission of the Soviet Union.

209. We deem it a great honour that the Council has extended an invitation to the PLO to participate in this debate. We wish to thank all the members of the Council, regardless of the attitude of some.

210. Let me express at the outset our great satisfaction that you, Sir, a son of Africa and the representative of a country member of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, should have assumed the responsibility of presiding over the deliberations of the Council on an issue threatening international peace and security—deliberations mainly on acts of savagery by neo-Fascist troops of occupation in Lebanon. We are certain that, with your wisdom and dedication to the cause of oppressed peoples and to the cause of peace, you will guide these deliberations to results in conformity with the aims of the United Nations as spelled out in the Charter of the United Nations.

211. For the past few weeks the world has been witnessing on television screens and reading in the press horrors reminiscent of Nazi crimes and the holocaust. The Council is being informed daily of such acts of savagery against civilians in Lebanese territory under Israeli occupation. The latest such information was given to the Council at the beginning of these meetings: Nazi-like atrocities, such as standing people up against a wall and shooting them in cold blood.

212. I wish to recall that on a number of occasions Chairman Yasser Arafat alerted the Secretary-General and the Security Council in letters expressing his grave concern about the future of civilian populations, including Palestinian refugees. He also stressed the responsibilities of the United Nations. We Palestinians have suffered and we continue to suffer the atrocities perpetrated by the neo-Fascists of Tel Aviv.

213. Those neo-Fascist troops in southern Lebanon have shown no discrimination as to whether the victims are men, women or children—whether Lebanese or Palestinian, farmers ploughing their fields or worshippers of one faith or sect or another fulfilling their religious obligations. To the neo-Fascists, all those who resist the continuation of the occupation are the "enemy".

214. This *modus operandi* of the Fascists is not incidental; nor is it a newly developed method of action. We Palestinians have been and are still being subjected to such acts of State terrorism against civilian populations in the occupied territories—be it in southern Lebanon or Bethlehem. And here one must surely wonder whether these acts are in retaliation or whether they are the implementation of an ideology aimed at the elimination of all "alien elements" from the racist, exclusivist State of Israel. Are these acts in pursuance of a *Lebensraum* policy?

215. Members of the Council will recall that on 29 October 1967 the then Prime Minister of Israel, Eshkol, was reported by the Associated Press to have appealed for mass immigration from Western nations to increase the Jewish population of Israel and to settle the occupied West Bank. He was quoted as having said:

> "We need more Jews here in Israel . . .". They were also needed "in places where we don't exist today but which have biblical names."

It is significant to note here his reference to "places where we don't exist today but which have biblical names". The Zionist *Lebensraum* in Lebanon is common knowledge; it dates back to 1919, when the Zionist organization made public its aim for a Zionist homeland, as follows:

> "at a point on the Mediterranean Sea in the vicinity of Sidon and following the watersheds of the foothills of the Lebanon as far as Jisr El-Kara'on, then to El-Bire . . .".

That is but one of their ambitions in Lebanon.

216. According to the memoirs, dated 27 February 1954, of a former Israeli Prime Minister, Sharett, the following is noted:

> "Ben Gurion passed on to another issue. This is the time, he said, to push Lebanon, that is, the Maronites in that country, to proclaim a Christian State. I said that this was nonsense. The Maronites are divided. The partisans of Christian separatism are weak and will dare to do nothing. A Christian Lebanon would mean their giving up Tyre, Tripoli, the Bekaa. There is no force that could bring Lebanon back to its pre-World War I dimensions, and all the more so because in that case it would lose its economic raison d'être. Ben Gurion reacted furiously. He began to enumerate the historical justification for a restricted Christian Lebanon. If such a development were to take place, the Christian Powers would not dare oppose it. I claimed that there was no factor ready to create such a situation and that if we were to push and encourage it on our own we would get ourselves into an adventure that would place shame on us."

217. I have sensed no Christian support for the Nazi-like crimes which are committed by the Israeli forces of occupation—not only not from Christian sources, but from any other source.

218. According to Sharett, Ben Gurion was not satisfied and addressed a letter to him on 27 February 1954, in which he said:

> "It is clear that Lebanon is the weakest link in the Arab League. The other minorities in the Arab States are all Moslem, except for the Copts. But Egypt is the most compact and solid of the Arab States and the majority there consists of one solid block, of one race, religion and language, and the Christian minority does not seriously affect their political and national unity. Not so the Christians in Lebanon. They are a majority in the historical Lebanon and this majority has a tradition and a culture different from those of the other components of the League . . . But at times of confusion, or revolution or civil war, things take on another aspect, and even the weak declares himself to be a hero."

219. I shall not take up any more of the Council's time by citing everything that went on. But we know that on 16

May, Dayan—and everyone remembers who he was—said, according to Sharett's memoirs,

> "According to Dayan the only thing that's necessary is to find an officer, even just a major. We should either win his heart or buy him with money to make him agree to declare himself the saviour of the Maronite population."

220. We can clearly see what the Israelis are up to: they want that part of southern Lebanon.

221. Again one may recall that in 1978, in another Israeli act of aggression which resulted in the occupation of southern Lebanon, the then Israeli Chief of Staff, Mordechai Gur, had no hesitation in boasting about acts of savagery against the civilians under Israeli occupation. He told a journalist:

> "I do not lie to myself. I gave this order to the army. When I give an order to the IDF [Israeli Defense Forces] to enter a populated area, and when I authorize a doctrine of fire, I know what I am doing. When I ordered Yanush [Commander-in-Chief of the Northern Zone] to use planes, artillery and tanks, I knew what I was doing. When I told Yanush 'Move tanks into Maroun El-Ras as quickly as possible and shell the village from a distance before our men arrive and engage in a face-to-face battle', I did know what I was doing. I was the one who gave that order."

So, that spirit of criminal instinct is nothing new.

222. Need one recall that at Nuremburg, Nazi officers were brought to trial because they killed civilian hostages, and it did not help those officers to claim that the civilian population was hostile to them. Those officers, as we recall, were sentenced to death and executed, and that was because Nazi racism, Nazi *Lebensraum* and Nazi brutality were defeated. Soon the world will celebrate its triumph 40 years ago over facism and Nazism.

223. I wonder whether the neo-Nazis in the Zionist junta will participate in celebrating this commemorative event, or will lament the defeat of their allies and collaborators? Naturally, this is not the subject of our debate today, but, of course, when one refers to the collaboration between the Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Nazis, one has to remember those things.

224. When we speak about the civilian population being hostile to the forces of occupation, hostility *per se* is not sufficient. What is needed is activity and militant resistance against the forces of occupation. It is armed struggle. It is a right, it is an inalienable right, a right of people to resist. This has also been legitimized by the General Assembly.

225. It has been claimed that these acts of violence are committed when Israel "has embarked on withdrawing its troops from Lebanon". This is a big lie, because the Israeli Cabinet has not—I repeat, has not—decided to withdraw from Lebanon in pursuance of Council resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982). The Israeli Cabinet had decided, in the second phase, to deploy—mark my word—to deploy in the eastern sector of Lebanon, and, in the third phase, "Israel has decided that the IDF will deploy along the Israeli/Lebanese international border while maintaining a zone in southern Lebanon where local forces [South Lebanese Army] will operate with IDF backing."

226. The Lebanese people, the heroes who are putting up armed resistance, do not suffer over diplomatic niceties. For them, as for us Palestinians, deployment is not withdrawal; and the third phase of the so-called withdrawal is the implementation and entrenchment of the Zionist aims and ambitions in Lebanon, as exposed by Moshe Sharett and to which we referred earlier.

227. The heroes in that area are sending to Tel Aviv a very loud and clear message: resolution 509 (1982) calls for the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel and, ultimately, Israeli troops from all of Lebanon; maintaining Israeli control by proxy is not the will of the Lebanese people and consequently they exercise their right and carry out their duty to resist foreign occupation, including by the method of armed struggle.

228. The press has been reporting Rabin's "iron-fist" policy and action against Lebanon. As far as we remember, the "iron-fist" methodology to fulfil Zionist aims was predicated by the twisted thinking of a Zionist leader called Jabotinsky, whose memory is perpetuated on Israeli currency. Thus one can discern no difference in the attitude of Zionists towards others in the pursuit of achieving Zionist aims. Be they the Herut or the Labour Party, they are all criminally inclined to achieve their aim, namely, the elimination of others.

229. Unfortunately, this is also a method that the United States Government subscribes to, as was stated in this chamber before the Council by a distinguished—if I may say that—representative of the United States, when he used his negative vote [*2556th meeting*] to veto a draft resolution [*S/16732*] calling for a cessation of hostilities in Lebanon simply because it did not include reference to the elimination of Palestinian armed elements.

230. The Council has been subjected to attempts at diverting its attention. For example, the representative of the United States mentioned a cycle of violence. Now this is a malicious attempt to divert the attention and thrust of this deliberation and debate. In our opinion there is no cycle of violence; there is on the one hand Israeli aggression, Israeli fascist crimes, Israeli occupation, and on the other hand, there is the noble cause of resistance against occupation and there are the Lebanese who are heroically carrying out their duty, as well as exercising their right. So the cycle of violence does not exist.

231. The representative of the United States spoke about a rationale of conduct. She expressed concern about the rejection of what she called threats to members of the Council and their nationals. Now, this is demented logic, for how can we describe the acts of aggression by

the United States when it mined the territorial waters of Nicaragua, which was then a member of the Council? How can we explain the issuance by the United States Congress of Public Law 98-151 of 14 November 1983? I will spare the Council a reading of that. I trust that it may appear in the record. But that is a threat to the developing economies of nations. Is it not a crime in itself to institutionalize such threats against developing nations?

232. Let me assure the representative of the United States that all the support it shows to the junta in Tel Aviv and all the contacts, deliberations and bargaining by Assistant Secretary of State Murphy in the area, including the use of Lebanon and the Lebanese people as a bargaining chip in some deliberations and negotiations, will fail. We thought that the Washington Administration had learned a lesson when the Camp David process failed to bring peace to the area. At that time, the future of the Palestinian people was used as a bargaining chip. As the Camp David Accords were doomed to fail, so too are Murphy's deliberations.

233. Finally, the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all of Lebanon will definitely provide the atmosphere for no resistance, and consequently there will be no need for further deliberation in the Council, at least in so far as Lebanon is concerned.

234. In fulfilment of their obligations under the Charter, the members of the Council are called upon to deem it proper now to impose mandatory sanctions against Israel as a punishment for its acts of savagery and its continued threat to peace in the area, as well as to international peace and security.

235. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

236. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I wonder what your intentions are about how we should proceed further in this debate. I notice we still have a lengthy list of speakers, and I do not even know whether the list in front of me is a comprehensive list or whether there may yet be more. Given the lateness of the hour and conflicting engagements which some of us have, I personally would find it convenient if we were to close our deliberations for this evening rather soon.

237. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to recall that at our 2570th meeting I said I intended at today's meeting to continue the debate on the item on our agenda so that the Council might hear those representatives that had not been able to speak, and that we would then proceed to a vote on the draft resolution [*S/17000*]. That is what was agreed at the 2570th meeting. There are now 10 speakers on my list. Since there had been no formal request for suspension of the meeting, it was my intention to proceed in accordance with what I said at the 2570th meeting, that is, to exhaust our list of speakers this evening and proceed to a vote on the draft resolution. Is the representative of the United Kingdom satisfied with this response?

238. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, thank you for recalling what you said before. As I have already explained, I would prefer the Council to continue its discussion tomorrow morning, since we still have a lengthy list of speakers and there may well be more. If we do proceed to a vote tonight, there will certainly be a number of explanations of vote, so we shall not be hearing just 10 speakers; we shall get up to I do not know what number. In short, I hope we can continue tomorrow.

239. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): As you know, I am in the hands of the members of the Council. Would the representative of the United Kingdom like to call for the application of rule 33 to end the meeting? If so, I should be happy to ask the Council if it agrees to the application of that rule.

240. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): Yes, I should be happy if we could do that.

241. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The point raised by the representative of the United Kingdom falls under rule 33, which reads:

"The following motions shall have precedence in the order named over all principal motions and draft resolutions relative to the subject before the meeting:

"1. To suspend the meeting;

"2. To adjourn the meeting;

"3. To adjourn the meeting to a certain day or hour;

"4. To refer any matter to a committee, to the Secretary-General or to a rapporteur;

"5. To postpone discussion of the question to a certain day or indefinitely; or

"6. To introduce an amendment.

"Any motion for the suspension or for the simple adjournment of the meeting shall be decided without debate."

242. The members of the Council have heard the proposal made by the representative of the United Kingdom. Is there any objection to approval of that proposal? It appears not. The proposal is approved.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

NOTES

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[2] *Ibid.*, No. 973.

[3] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1915).

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-61439—June 1994—1,925

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2573rd MEETING: 12 MARCH 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2573)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 25 February 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16983)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2573rd MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 12 March 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Blaise RABETAFIKA (Madagascar).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2573)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:
   Letter dated 25 February 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16983).

The meeting was called to order at 11.35 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 25 February 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16983)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decisions taken by the Council at previous meetings [*2568th, 2570th and 2572nd meetings*], I invite the representative of Lebanon to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Algeria, Bangladesh, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Jordan, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber; I invite the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fakhoury (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. Wasiuddin (Bangladesh), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Phedonos-Vadet (Cyprus), Mr. César (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Alfi (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Alatas (Indonesia), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Netanyahu (Israel), Mr. Kasrawi (Jordan), Mr. Icaza Gallard (Nicaragua), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Nowak (Poland), Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar), Mr. Shihabi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Sarré (Senegal), Mr. Omer (Sudan), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Al-Shaali (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam) and Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber; Mr. Terzi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The first speaker is the representative of Cyprus. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

3. Mr. PHEDONOS-VADET (Cyprus): I should like at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of March, and to express my appreciation to Mr. Krishnan of India for the exemplary manner in which he presided over the work of the Council in February.

4. Let me also express the grief of the people and the Government of the Republic of Cyprus on the passing away of Mr. Konstantin Chernenko, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. President Chernenko will be remembered for the reputation he gained as a tireless worker for world peace and as a leader for the progress of the Soviet peoples.

5. It is with grave concern that the Government of Cyprus views the latest Israeli operations and practices which the representative of Lebanon has brought to the attention of the Council in his statement of 28 February at the 2068th meeting, and the continued occupation of southern Lebanon. We express our deepest regret at the worsening situation which threatens peace and security in the area.

6. In this connection, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international conventions, more particularly the fourth Geneva Convention,[1] are recalled, as is the applicability of the provisions of that Convention to the Lebanese territories occupied by the State of Israel.

7. The continuing Israeli practices and measures against the civilian population in southern Lebanon, western Bekaa and the Rashaya district are in violation of the rules and principles of international law, and in particular

the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention, and should immediately be brought to an end.

8. Attention is drawn to the Political Declaration of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in March 1983 at New Delhi [*see S/15675 and Corr.1 and 2, annex*], and the final communiqué adopted by the Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegations of Non-Aligned Countries to the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session, held in October 1984 [*S/16773, annex*], as well as the communiqué adopted on 6 March 1985 by the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at an urgent meeting held in New York [*S/17008, annex*], which condemned these practices and measures. Moreover, the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, in its communiqué of 6 March, expressed its support for the efforts of the Government of Lebanon to extend its authority over all of its territory and for its determination to restore peace and order in the areas to be evacuated by Israel and to ensure the safety and security of the civilian populations in those areas, including the Palestinian refugees in the camps [*ibid., para. 4*].

9. We strongly reiterate the need for Council resolutions on Lebanon, particularly resolutions 425 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), to be urgently implemented to ensure the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territories.

10. The Government and people of Cyprus reaffirm their unfailing and full solidarity with the people of friendly and neighbouring Lebanon and reiterate support for the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and unity of Lebanon and for its right to exercise its sovereignty throughout its territory.

11. It is earnestly hoped that urgent Security Council action, so necessary in bringing peace and stability to Lebanon, will finally be taken.

12. The Council has before it draft resolution S/17000, submitted by Lebanon. Its adoption by the Council would demonstrate a clear determination by the international community to ensure respect for the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and unity of Lebanon and its profound solidarity with and sympathy for its much tormented people.

13. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Indonesia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

14. Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia): Mr. President, allow me to preface my statement by expressing the sense of loss and deep sympathy of my Government and my delegation on the passing away of Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. We are saddened that he is no longer with us at a time when the world has reached a critical juncture in the efforts to strengthen international peace and security, efforts to which as a world leader he made significant contributions. I would be greatly indebted if the Soviet delegation could kindly convey our heartfelt condolences to the Government and people of the Soviet Union and to the members of the bereaved family in their hour of sorrow.

15. I should like to begin by extending to you, Sir, the warm congratulations of the Indonesian delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We take particular satisfaction in seeing you in the Chair, because the country you represent, a fellow member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, is Indonesia's near neighbour to the west across a span of water which, far from dividing our two countries and peoples, has historically contributed to the nurturing of close ties of friendship and cultural and political affinity between us. Your proven diplomatic skills and vast experience give us confidence that the Council's deliberations on the matter before us will be conducted in a most efficacious way. I should also like to pay high tribute to your predecessor, Mr. Krishnan of India, for the exemplary manner in which he guided the Council's work during the month of February.

16. My delegation's participation in the Council's debate is to express Indonesia's sense of outrage at what is happening in Lebanon at present as a consequence of the brutal acts of terror unleashed by Israel against the civilian population of southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district. Our indignation is heightened given the fact that Israel is continuing and even escalating such practices in the face of numerous Security Council resolutions and world-wide censure, and at the very time the Council is being seized of the question. Indeed, as we are meeting today the press has reported yet another barbarous raid against the village of Zarariyah causing indiscriminate destruction and a death toll of at least 30.

17. The representative of Lebanon, in his statements before the Council [*2568th, 2570th and 2572nd meetings*] and in his letters to the Secretary-General, has recorded in graphic detail the atrocities that are being perpetrated by the Israeli occupation forces, including the siege of villages and towns, killings, mass arrests and detentions, forced exile and the demolition of schools and homes. They paint a compelling picture of the humiliation, hardships and horrors to which the people in southern Lebanon have been subjected ever since the Israeli invasion.

18. Thus while there is no need for me to go into further details, my delegation must register its particular revulsion at the incident involving the large-scale attack launched on the village of M'arakah, as described in document S/16997. Israel's utter disregard for civilian lives and the sanctity of places of worship was appallingly demonstrated when, with cold-blooded premeditation, the village mosque was blown up at a time when as many as 200 people were gathered inside. We condemn this dastardly attack and deeply regret the resultant death and injury to so many innocent civilians.

19. Israel has tried to justify its flouting of the most elementary norms of international law and morality with a variety of excuses. But for Israel to equate the heroic nationalist resistance of the Lebanese people—the legitimate armed struggle of the people of Lebanon against foreign aggression and occupation—with terrorism, and then to react indiscriminately with the unbridled force of its war machine, can only be described as the height of insolence. Clearly Israel cannot hide behind the pretext of self-defence to justify its illegal presence in southern Lebanon, nor can it rationalize its inhuman acts and practices. Indeed, as the occupying Power, Israel must not be allowed to evade the onus of responsibility to the international community for its gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations, of the fourth Geneva Convention[1] and of other norms of civilized behaviour.

20. In the midst of these provocations, the constructive and statesmanlike attitude of the Lebanese Government has been most praiseworthy. We commend its sincere attempts to bring about an orderly and planned withdrawal of the Israeli occupation forces and to make arrangements to achieve security and stability after the withdrawal through the co-ordinated deployment of the Lebanese army in the vacated areas.

21. However, these efforts by Lebanon at the military talks in Naqoura under the commendable initiative of the Secretary-General were aborted due, *inter alia*, to Israel's refusal to provide a detailed timetable for its withdrawal. Instead, Israel has now embarked on a unilateral staged withdrawal—or, rather, redeployment—of its forces, thus presenting Lebanon and the United Nations with an arbitrary *fait accompli*.

22. Israel's intransigence in this regard and its unwillingness to allow the Lebanese army to play any role can only be seen as part and parcel of its persistent attempts to set up illegitimate local forces in southern Lebanon as a surrogate authority under its total control. It is with this same sinister motive in mind that Israel has wilfully violated the terms of Security Council resolution 425 (1978) by denying the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) forces access to areas south of the Litani River and attempting to remove United Nations personnel already deployed in those areas. My Government regards the implications of these developments with grave concern, as they directly contravene Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), the latter of which calls on Israel to withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries and reaffirms the need for respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon.

23. The world has witnessed time and again the futility of the use of force as an instrument of conflict resolution. Indeed, Israel's invasion and occupation of Lebanon has not achieved for it any of its stated objectives. On the contrary, it has pushed the spiral of violence, death and destruction in the region to even greater heights, while embedding Israel in a quagmire of its own making from which it is now frantically trying to extricate itself.

24. In the view of my delegation, the only way to put an effective end to the illegal Israeli occupation of Lebanon is by scrupulously implementing the relevant resolutions of the Council, and in particular resolutions 425 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982).

25. In the face of Israel's open defiance, we trust the Council will act resolutely and with a sense of urgency to reassert its authority. We hope that the Council will speak with one voice in condemning the inhuman Israeli practices and measures against the civilian population in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district and in demanding that Israel desist forthwith from such practices.

26. The sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of Lebanon must be respected. The legitimacy and effectiveness of the Lebanese army must be upheld; all further unilateral acts by Israel should be stopped; and UNIFIL should be allowed to play the indispensable role entrusted to it by the relevant Security Council resolutions.

27. As the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has already done in the communiqué adopted on 6 March at its urgent meeting held in New York, the international community should extend full support to the efforts of the Lebanese Government to establish its authority over all of its territory and to its determination to restore peace and order in the areas to be vacated by Israel and to ensure the safety and security of the civilian populations in those areas, including the Palestinian refugees [*S/17008, annex, para. 4*].

28. It is only by pursuing this course of action that the Council and the world community at large can effectively address the awesome dimensions of the tragedy in Lebanon.

29. The Indonesian Government and people have followed the unfolding of recent developments in Lebanon with feelings of deep distress and mounting concern. At this time my delegation wishes to reiterate its full solidarity with and support for Lebanon and its fraternal people in their quest for peace and justice in unfettered independence and sovereignty.

30. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker on my list is the representative of Nicaragua. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

31. Mr. ICAZA GALLARD (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): At the outset I should like on behalf of my delegation, Government and people to convey to the Soviet Government and people our sorrow and condolences on the death of Konstantin Chernenko, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. We are convinced that his successor in such lofty responsibilities will pursue efforts to ensure international peace, coexistence and the development of peoples, as did Mr. Chernenko in his activities.

32. I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the current month. Your country and mine enjoy excellent relations based on mutual respect and co-operation, born of our need to face similar problems and to be dedicated to the principles of non-alignment in our international conduct. This, together with the special affection and admiration we feel for you, which can be explained by your well-known devotion to justice and your great experience in the diplomatic world, assures us that the Council is indeed in good hands.

33. Similarly, I should like to express our thanks to Mr. Natarajan Krishnan of India for the way in which he guided the proceedings of the Council last month.

34. As this is the first time we have spoken before the Council this year, after having completed our two-year term as a non-permanent member, I should like to thank all delegations with which we have worked. We should like to extend to them equal co-operation on the basis of friendship and respect in all areas of the United Nations. Our congratulations go to the new members of the Council, convinced that they will discharge their responsibilities and help this body discharge the functions entrusted to it by the Charter of the United Nations.

35. Approximately six months ago, when we were still members of the Council, it considered Israeli practices in occupied Arab territories [*2552nd to 2556th meetings*]. At that time—and not because of our position nor the position of the non-aligned countries, which have always had a clear position on the situation in the Middle East—the Council was unable to adopt a draft resolution that basically emphasized humanitarian considerations [*S/16732*].

36. The current situation that we are considering, involving Israeli practices perpetrated against the population of southern Lebanon, western Bekaa and the Rashaya district, regarding which the representative of Lebanon has on three occasions in the course of this debate [*2568th, 2570th and 2572nd meetings*] given us a great number of facts, proves that the Council's silence is invariably interpreted by Israel as constituting a blank cheque for it to pursue its policy of expansionism and illegal occupation of Arab territories, extermination of the Palestinian people and terrorism against the Arab population in general.

37. Today's newspapers carry new articles on events transpiring in southern Lebanon that are linked to other events perpetrated by the Israeli occupation forces in M'arakah and Beirut last week. Many innocent lives have been lost. Reference has been made to the existence of a "spiral of violence", a "vicious circle" of violence. However, if we do not look further than that assertion, which is designed to define an apparent reality, we see simply an attempt—often unintentional, but sometimes with ill intent—to hide the real causes of the violence. Here we have an illegal occupation of part of the territory of a sovereign country, an illegal occupation that has lasted several years, flying in the face of clearly expressed resolutions of the Council—in particular, resolution 509 (1982), which demands "that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon". This illegal occupation is contrary to all the principles and norms of international law. The occupying Power's policy, which is to use permanent and systematic violence against the Arab and Palestinian populations in the illegally occupied territories, involves a constant and systematic disrespect for the most fundamental rights of those populations. The occupying Power itself does not hesitate to describe it as an "iron fist" policy.

38. I shall not repeat here the endless chain of examples that make a reality of this "iron fist" policy. I need only mention the invasion of M'arakah, south of the Litani. The barbaric acts committed by the occupying forces, culminating in the blowing up of the mosque in which 200 innocent people had sought refuge, are a clear example of the "spiral of violence" many representatives have mentioned here.

39. How many times will it be necessary to repeat and recall these deeds and concepts? There is an increasingly clear deliberate tendency to subvert language and falsify facts. Therefore, we could not but show our perplexity when we heard a permanent member of the Council state at one of the recent meetings:

> "The Charter of the United Nations tells us that its central tenet must be freedom from fear, freedom from threats against the territorial integrity or political independence of a State, freedom from threats against any Member of the United Nations—certainly against any member of the Security Council" [*2570th meeting, para. 127*].

We could not help showing our perplexity when we heard that same member say:

> "No process of discussion, debate, compromise and rational decision-making can possibly take place under the threat of violence" [*ibid., para. 131*].

Said by any other Member of the United Nations of the Security Council, that would be no more than the reaffirmation of a principle that we all believe in and jointly defend, and on which our international conduct is based. In view of who said it, we have only two alternatives: either we should congratulate that representative on what seems to be an intention by her country to conduct its policy in accordance with an unalterable principle of the Charter—in which case we should ask her to advise its President to conduct himself similarly—or we should interpret those words as a mere statement totally lacking in seriousness.

40. Our position with regard to the situation in Lebanon has been clear from the very outset, and it became even clearer during the two years we served as a non-permanent member of the Council. That position is fully in accordance with the position frequently stated by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries—most recently, in its communiqué of 6 March [*S/17008, annex*]. It can be summed up as follows: full support for the relevant resolutions of the Council, in particular resolutions 425 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), the latter of which calls for the immediate

and unconditional withdrawal of all Israel's military forces behind the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon. Our position is for a clear and vigorous condemnation of all Israeli practices and measures against the civilian population in illegally occupied sovereign Lebanese territory, practices and measures in flagrant contravention of the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention.[1] Finally, our position is one of unconditional and unreserved support for the sovereignty, independence, non-alignment and territorial unity and integrity of Lebanon, and for the people and the Government of Lebanon in their just struggle against the occupying forces.

41. We hope that on this occasion the Council will measure up to its responsibilities in voting for the draft resolution before it [*S/17000*], whose provisions entirely accord with my Government's position on this matter.

42. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Poland. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

43. Mr. NOWAK (Poland): The delegation of Poland wishes to express its sorrow at the passing away of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. Together with the fraternal Soviet people, we mourn the passing of their leader, who devoted his life to selfless and tireless creative labour to benefit his own people and country and to serve the cause of peace in the world at large. Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko won sincere respect in my country and contributed to deepening relations between Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Permit me to convey to the delegations of the Soviet Union and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and through them to Comrade Chernenko's family and the people of the Soviet Union, our condolences and expression of profound sympathy and great sorrow.

44. Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your accession to the presidency for this month. May I express our confidence that your diplomatic skills, experience and wisdom will contribute to the efficiency and fruitfulness of the Council's deliberations.

45. At the same time, I wish to express the sincere appreciation of my delegation to Mr. Krishnan, the representative of India, for the way in which he guided the Council's proceedings in February.

46. The delegation of Poland asked to be invited to speak before the Council in order to express the Polish Government's concern and indignation over the Israeli acts of repression in southern Lebanon and to support the demands of Lebanon, namely, to stop Israeli measures against the civilian population and to withdraw its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon.

47. Every day brings new reports of widespread Israeli repressive measures which are exacerbating tensions, deepening resentment among the population and strengthening its support for armed resistance to the occupying Power. It goes without saying that this new policy of the Israeli authorities, called by some of its own leaders an "iron fist" policy, poses a serious threat to peace and security not only in the region but also in the world at large.

48. The delegation of Poland fully shares the opinion repeated by the majority of delegations speaking before the Council that the actions of the Israeli occupation authorities are in clear violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention[1] and other norms of international law. The Israelis' attempts to vindicate the actions of their occupying forces boil down to trying to justify a policy based on the use of force and claim the legitimacy of a threat to the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of another State. That reasoning cannot be accepted by the international community and should be rejected. Furthermore, whatever may be the claims of the Israeli authorities, it is the aspirations of the Lebanese people to sovereignty and full control of its internal affairs that are legitimate and based on principles of international law.

49. It is the invasion by Israel of Lebanon in June 1982 and its repeated acts of repression that initiated the circle of violence. The general policy of the Israeli authorities, supported by their strategic ally, the United States, can lead only to the deepening of the crisis and the intensification on a broader scale of the threat of conflagration in this very sensitive region.

50. The solution of the Lebanese problem lies in the speedy implementation of Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), in whose drafting and unanimous vote the delegation of Poland had the honour to participate in 1982 as a non-permanent member of the Council. Israel should be made to abide by its obligations under the fourth Geneva Convention and the norms of international law. The Israeli inhuman practices must be stopped and the Israeli forces must withdraw forthwith. The safety and security of the civilian population, including that of the Palestinian refugees, should be safeguarded.

51. There is another point to which my delegation wishes to draw the attention of the Council. This is the situation of UNIFIL. Speaking before the Council on 7 March [*2570th meeting*], the representative of Lebanon pointed out that Israel had no respect for UNIFIL, a Force which continues to be the agent of Security Council decisions. There were distressing reports of disrespect towards UNIFIL and obstruction of its carrying out its mandate.

52. Let me recall that since October 1973 Polish soldiers have been serving in the Middle East under the United Nations flag, first in the United Nations Emergency Force and then, until this day, in the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force. With their dedicated service, Poland is doing more than giving merely verbal support to the cause of peace in the region. Therefore, as a country deeply interested in strengthening United Nations peace-keeping functions in conformity with provisions of the Charter and decisions of the Council, Poland follows UNIFIL's situa-

tion in southern Lebanon with concern. The proper conditions must be restored for UNIFIL to perform its present functions. Furthermore, we think that UNIFIL could play an even greater role in assisting the process of Israel's complete withdrawal and in safeguarding peace in the region in the future.

53. To conclude, my delegation wishes to add its voice to the voices of other delegations which have appealed to the Security Council to implement the provisions of its resolutions on Lebanon urgently and unanimously.

54. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Nigeria in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite him to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Garba (Nigeria) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

55. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I invite the representative of Nigeria to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

56. Mr. GARBA (Nigeria): On behalf of the Nigerian delegation, I wish first of all to join the delegations which have preceded ours in expressing our deepest condolences to the people and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the passing away of Mr. Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. Mr. Chernenko's death is a loss not only to his great country but to the whole world. The world has indeed lost a great leader in the fight for peace and the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism. I should like to request my colleague, Mr. Troyanovsky, to convey the sympathy of the Nigerian delegation to the bereaved family and to the people and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

57. May I extend our heartiest welcome to you, Sir, on your assumption of the office of President for this month. We are delighted with your presidency at this particular time. We are mindful of the importance of your position, and we are thus pleased with the circumstance of your steering these deliberations.

58. I would like also to place on record our deep appreciation of the stewardship of your immediate predecessor, our respected colleague Mr. Krishnan of India.

59. My delegation has listened with interest to the statements on the important subject before the Council. We have also followed closely the events that have been unfolding in Lebanon over the past few years. We have carefully read the complaints of the representative of Lebanon contained in documents S/16974 and Add.1, S/16990 and S/16997. It is quite clear to us, as it should be to anyone who has followed the situation closely in that country, that the illegal occupation of parts of Lebanese territory by Israel has created a very dangerous situation inimical to peace and security in the entire area. The circumstances alone are repugnant, but even worse, the Israeli occupation armed forces have resorted to several practices and measures against the unarmed population in the areas under their occupation. These practices not only constitute a gross violation of the norms and principles of international law upon which the relationships between States are founded but in fact directly violate the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention.[1] This situation should not be allowed to continue.

60. It is also disturbing and sad to note that the crisis in Lebanon has continued in spite of the action of the Council in the past. On several occasions, the Council considered developments in Lebanon, especially those with serious implications for the international community, and adopted resolutions urging the parties to create conditions for peace and negotiations. The resolutions have gone unheeded, and quite unfortunately and regrettably, the Council itself has not been able to implement its own resolutions.

61. It will be recalled, for instance, that in 1978 the Council adopted resolution 425 (1978), which duly recognized the deteriorating situation in the region and its consequences for the maintenance of international peace and called for strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. It further called on Israel immediately to cease its military action against Lebanon and withdraw forthwith its forces from Lebanese territory.

62. Again, in 1982, the Council noted the continuing and unabated deterioration in the situation in Lebanon and adopted two resolutions: resolution 508 (1982) and resolution 509 (1982). There is no better testimony to the seriousness of the situation and the resolute commitment of the Council to arrest or repair an unacceptable situation.

63. In resolution 509 (1982), the Council demanded that Israel should withdraw, forthwith and unconditionally, all its military forces to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon. That call was ignored, and the international community again stood by helplessly while national obduracy prevailed over international good offices and admonition.

64. We are unhappy and disturbed by the persistent hallmark of total disregard of the Council's resolutions in matters pertaining to the Middle East and Lebanon. The situation whereby resolutions are adopted but their provisions remain unimplemented and deliberately ignored can continue only with prospects of severe consequences for the role envisaged for the Security Council as the principal organ charged with the maintenance of international peace and security. In the present circumstances, it will not suffice for the Council merely to adopt another resolution

condemning those practices and measures and demanding, as it has done on numerous occasions, that Israel withdraw to the internationally recognized boundaries. The Council must act to implement its resolutions, in particular resolutions 425 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982).

65. Nigeria for its part reaffirms its support for the efforts of the Government of Lebanon to extend its authority over all its territory and its determination to restore peace and order and to ensure the safety and security of its civilian population, including the Palestinian refugees in the various camps.

66. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Saudi Arabia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

67. Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia) (*interpretation from Arabic*): On behalf of the delegation of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, I express our sincere condolences on the death of President Chernenko to Mr. Troyanovsky and the Soviet Union delegation and, through them, to the bereaved family and the people and Government of the Soviet Union. The world-wide echo of the Soviet Union's great loss is evidence of the high esteem in which the President was held. The world has lost a great leader at a time when it needs his wisdom in the efforts and endeavours being made to solve complicated international problems.

68. Mr. President, in addressing the Council for the second time in two weeks, it gives me pleasure to reiterate the expression of my confidence that your wisdom and experience will lead us to the results that will give the Charter of the United Nations its due and satisfy the expectations of peoples which look to the United Nations to uphold their Charter-enshrined rights and to adopt a resolution that will express the message of truth on behalf of us all.

69. Representatives are all aware of what is now going on in Lebanon: Israeli troops of occupation and destruction have invaded Lebanon, an independent State and a Member of the United Nations. Israel, supported by an overwhelming war machine and a sense of immunity from punishment, attempted to take over all of Lebanon. But right was stronger than Israel and punishment awaited it. It is now leaving Lebanon, having been defeated in every objective except the criminal aim of killing the innocent and destroying the country.

70. The Israeli authorities, emboldened by all the military assistance and political support that they are getting, think they will be able to crush the will of peoples. But we know, and big Powers know very well from experience—a bitter experience in most cases—that a people defending its land, religion and honour, whether that land be Lebanon or Palestine, will never be defeated. This is now known to the Zionist war machine from experience, no matter how it or the Powers which support it try to ignore this basic human reality. The same fate that has befallen those who have pursued such a course awaits anyone who would follow in their path. It is inevitable that those who have justice on their side will be victorious, however long the road may be.

71. The Israeli authorities are challenging the essence of human nature and know that time is working against them. Throughout the last 38 years of battles, invasion campaigns, individual and collective attacks and crimes of every type and dimension, this reckless force has failed to subjugate peoples which reject this tyranny and cling to their rights to the end.

72. Although Hitler's Nazi war machinery set the pattern of collective and individual brutality and murder, the Israeli authorities have now surpassed him. And just like Hitler's, their end will be inevitable if the world does not stop them before it is too late.

73. What is the Israeli army of invasion doing on the soil of Lebanon, an independent country? What crimes it is committing: encircling villages, subjecting the people to the ugliest terrorist operations, attacking schools, holy places and medical clinics, kidnapping patients from hospitals—even from operating rooms, firing recklessly on the population—men, women, the elderly and children—using all the instruments of murder and destruction, from rifles and cluster bombs to tanks and aeroplanes.

74. Those crimes began against the Arab people of Palestine, and are continuing, with the same ugliness and criminality, against the Arab people of Lebanon. Rights are being stolen and trampled upon in Lebanon, in Palestine and in the Golan. The invasions, crimes and excesses which are being brazenly committed day and night are well known to United Nations observers and are confirmed by all independent observers.

75. From previous speakers the Council has heard in sufficient detail about the crimes committed by the retreating Israeli army of invasion, which failed when confronted by the will of the Lebanese people. As members of the Council, we cannot fail to adopt a resolution in keeping with at least our minimum responsibilities under the Charter. The members of the Council bear a grave responsibility regarding global and regional peace and security, and an even graver responsibility regarding their commitment to the Charter and to the norms of international conduct. I must note that certain current attempts to make it difficult for the Council to adopt a resolution constitute a serious attempt to divert the Council from its most important basic responsibilities.

76. What, then, is Lebanon, along with every unbiased and fair-minded person, asking of the Council? It is asking for a resolution in which the Council reaffirms its principles and upholds the Charter, in which it reinforces the stand it took in its resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982). There is before the Council a draft resolution [*S/17000*] which represents the minimum that the Council can adopt in keeping with its level of international credibility. On behalf of my country, I express the hope that the Council will respond positively to the Lebanese complaint, in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the Charter, and I call on all Council members to fulfil their responsibility to adopt a resolution by which the Council can discharge its duty.

77. The Israeli authorities have completely ignored the Council's resolutions and continue to commit their crimes against the Palestinians, both in Palestine and in Lebanon, having driven them from their homeland in the first place, as well as against the Lebanese in Lebanon, whom they have tried to displace from their own homes. The failure to make Israel comply with resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) is one of the factors that have encouraged it to commit the crimes of which Lebanon is complaining now.

78. Among the absurdities put forward in this chamber in an attempt to justify the Israeli crimes was the talk about Lebanon's relations with its neighbours and about relations among the various factions of the Lebanese people itself. Is that Israel's concern? Is Israel Lebanon's guardian? Will Israel continue to fabricate pretexts for committing its expansionist crimes whenever it wants to, first in Palestine and then—who knows where?

79. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia supports Lebanon and supports the people of Lebanon. It supports the rights and territorial integrity of Lebanon, and it condemns in the fullest sense of that word the crime of the invasion of Lebanon. We condemn what Israel has perpetrated during its mad invasion and what, having failed, it is perpetrating during its retreat. We condemn the crimes committed by the Zionist forces, forces which were tyrannical because of their presence in Lebanon in the first place and which are now utterly tyrannical in their individual and collective attacks against a free people which is trying to secure the freedom of its country from the yoke of injustice, colonialism and oppression. The Zionist forces of invasion do not differentiate between women and children, young men and old men: they murder them all collectively.

80. Many members of the Council glorified acts of national resistance during invasions of their countries by foreign forces, and they must understand those who are dying in defence of their religion, their honour and their country against a terrorist invasion whose sole objective is domination and colonization.

81. If the Israeli authorities want peace and security for their people, the road they must follow is known and clearly marked. That road has already been demarcated by the Arabs and has been rejected by Israel. The road taken by the Israeli authorities, the road which they have been following since 1948, has not only increased their fears and vulnerability, but has heightened their sense of foreboding about an uncertain future, which is like the future of any criminal who is pursued by the law wherever he turns.

82. I am fully confident that the members of the Council will not hesitate once again to express what is right. I would add that the friends of the Israeli authorities could be of more service to them by telling them what is right than by pretending that what they are perpetrating is right while knowing full well that it is an evil which will turn against the perpetrator.

83. On behalf of my country, I express the hope that the Council will expedite the adoption of the draft resolution addressing the problems of Lebanon and constituting an important step in the process of dealing with the problems of the region as a whole. What constitutes a threat to Lebanon constitutes a threat to the security of the entire region. Arab security is a collective concept, and Arab rights are a total commitment. If the Council does not succeed in taking a position conforming to the provisions of the Charter, then it will not be Lebanon, or the Lebanese people, or the heroic inhabitants of southern Lebanon who will have failed: they are victors in any event, while Israeli methods will prove self-defeating and, in the long run, will turn against those who support them.

84. I have no doubt that we all appreciate the gravity of the issue before the Council and the importance of the Council's taking a correct stand that will enhance the credibility of the United Nations, impressing its respectability upon everyone.

85. The **PRESIDENT** (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Senegal. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

86. Mr. **SARRÉ** (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Yesterday, in this chamber, there was a very moving tribute to an illustrious Soviet leader, Mr. Konstantin Chernenko, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. His many qualities were described—above all, the initiatives he took in the context of détente among nations. I am sure that those initiatives will be pursued, to the benefit of the world and in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations. My delegation would ask Mr. Troyanovsky to be good enough to transmit the condolences of the Senegales delegation on the occasion of this great loss.

87. Like many previous speakers, I should like, Sir, at the outset to extend to you my congratulations and best wishes for success in your term as President of the Council. You are the dean of the African diplomatic corps in New York—not because of your age but because of your lengthy service here. We know that your great experience, your diplomatic skills and the confidence you enjoy within the Organization provide the best guarantee of the success of our deliberations.

88. Your predecessor, Mr. Krishnan, the representative of India, also deserves a tribute for the authority and competence with which he led the Council's work in February.

89. As this is the first time that I have addressed the Council this year, I take this opportunity to congratulate all the countries that became members of the Council at the beginning of 1985. I wish also to thank members of the Council for having been good enough to allow me to participate in this debate.

90. The Council's present discussion, which began on 28 February [*2568th meeting*], demonstrates, if that were still necessary, the deep concern that the situation in Lebanon continues to evoke in the international community. A direct outgrowth of the wider conflict that has beset the Middle East for some four decades, the tragedy that the

fraternal people of Lebanon are still experiencing has persisted for far too long. In this connection, the very clear and relevant statement to the Council on 28 February by the representative of Lebanon makes it unnecessary for us to revert in detail to the various aspects of Israel's conduct in occupied Lebanon.

91. We have said in previous statements before the Council, and we can never repeat enough, that the magnitude of the stakes involved in Lebanon requires that all the States Members of the Organization—particularly the members of the Security Council, and above all Israel—seriously commit themselves to enabling the Council to discharge its essential task: the promotion of peace and stability in a Lebanon which through our joint efforts shall have regained its identity. This brotherly country has the right to recover its territorial integrity so that it can continue to make its positive contribution to the attainment of the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. This country which has always set an example of communal life, regardless of religious or ethnic considerations, should be given the necessary encouragement and assistance so that its example may be followed by others.

92. In this connection, we believe that the draft resolution now before the Council [*S/17000*] contains all the elements that could restore peace to Lebanon and enable it to regain its independence and its territorial integrity. By demanding that Israel put an end to its occupation of Lebanese territory and commit itself to full respect for the provisions of the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the fourth Geneva Convention,[1] this draft resolution, if adopted, would be a decisive element for the restoration of peace in Lebanon and, above and beyond that, for the settlement of the wider problem of the Middle East, of which the Lebanese tragedy is only one aspect.

93. My country, Senegal, whose commitment and dedication to the cause of peace in the Middle East in general and in Lebanon in particular have never faltered—and eloquent testimony to this is provided by the recent joint communiqué issued at Cairo after the official visit by the Senegalese head of State, Mr. Abdou Diouf, to Egypt from 1 to 5 March—takes this opportunity to draw the international community's attention once again to the urgent need to redouble its efforts by taking a fresh look at the question of the Middle East.

94. As I have said, the present situation in Lebanon is but a reflection of a much wider situation—that is, the situation in the Middle East in all its aspects, and in particular the Palestine question, to which a just and lasting solution must be found. As everyone knows, until an honourable solution to that question has been found, any initiative, no matter how praiseworthy, may well meet with failure. On the basis of that objective international fact, my delegation believes that the Council, because of its responsibilities and in the light of the appeals by the General Assembly, should undertake a study of the best ways and means for convening an international peace conference on the Middle East.

95. Because of the recent diplomatic developments in the region and the increase in the acts of violence in Lebanon itself, the international conscience must ensure that there is a new movement towards peace, for that is the only viable solution for all the States of the region. If there is increased political will, we have available now all the elements that should enable us to achieve, with honour and dignity and in an atmosphere of restored confidence, a just and therefore lasting peace in the Middle East. We shall thereby make a great contribution, on the eve of the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, to giving concrete form to the theme of that anniversary: "The United Nations for a better world".

96. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Pakistan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

97. Mr. Shah NAWAZ (Pakistan): I should like to begin my settlement by expressing our deep sympathy and profound condolences to Mr. Troyanovsky and the entire Soviet delegation and to the bereaved family on the passing away of Konstantin Chernenko, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We share the grief and sorrow of the Government and the people of the Soviet Union at the loss of their great leader and outstanding statesman, whose absence from the international scene will be felt throughout the world.

98. Your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of March, Sir, is a source of great satisfaction to my delegation. The admirable manner in which you have guided the important deliberations of the Council during this very active month has won you our profound respect and testifies to your diplomatic skills and vast experience of international affairs. I am confident that your leadership will prove to be a great asset to the Council in carrying out its heavy responsibilities. I also wish to convey our sincere congratulations and pay a high tribute to Mr. Krishnan, of India, for the success with which he conducted the work of the Council last month.

99. Pakistan is deeply anguished by the intolerable situation prevailing in southern Lebanon, where the withdrawing Israeli troops are wreaking vengeance on the Lebanese civilian population and subjecting innocent men, women and children to indescribable acts of brutality. It is the innocent who suffer most from the terror unleashed in callous disregard of its consequences. In his statements of 28 February, 7 March and yesterday [*2568th, 2570th and 2572nd meetings*], as well as in the several communications he addressed to the Council, the representative of Lebanon has given details of the atrocities being committed by the Israeli troops in southern Lebanon. The desecration and destruction of Husseynjah Mosque in M'arakah, at a time when it was filled with worshippers, caused the death of 16 and injuries to 45 innocent persons. This violent action reflects Israel's callous disregard for the sanctity of Islamic religious places in the occupied territories. Israeli repression is continuous and omnipresent. One wonders where this gory wave of so-called reprisals will end. Three days

ago—on 9 March—a booby-trapped car exploded and killed 80 and wounded 200 people in a densely populated Beirut suburb. Only yesterday, Israeli troops sacked Zarariyah village and massacred its dwellers in cold blood.

100. The latest phase of violent Israeli actions in southern Lebanon is well chronicled in the international press. In the 7 March issue of *The Times* of London Robert Fisk, a celebrated observer of the Middle East scene, reported from Tyre that this Lebanese city had been turned into a place of terror and violence as a result of indiscriminate shootings, arrests, repeated curfews and house-to-house searches by the Israeli forces. Similar circumstances were reported from M'arakah, in the 8 March issue of *The New York Times*, by John Kifner, who managed to slip into southern Lebanon before it had been cordoned off by the Israeli army for foreign journalists. Giving an eye-witness account of the ruthless measures and practices adopted by the occupation troops in pursuit of the so-called iron-fist policy, Kifner reported growing resistance on the part of the local population against Israeli occupation. He observed that the anger and the increasing militancy of the population in southern Lebanon were entirely attributable to prolonged occupation and repressive measures by Israel.

101. Since the Israeli invasion of 1982, Lebanon has seen much bloodshed and violence and remains a dangerously inflamed area, threatening international peace and security. The continuation of the Israeli occupation has deepened the resentment of the local people and intensified resistance against it. The grim events of the past few days show that the chain of violence will not break as long as the Israeli presence lingers in southern Lebanon. Every new wave of terror will only serve to sow seeds of greater bitterness and hatred. Such violence will never succeed in breaking the spirit of the dauntless people of southern Lebanon, whose heroic sacrifices in the cause of freeing their homeland from Israeli occupation deserve our respect and admiration.

102. It is ironic that Israel should engage in terrorism in southern Lebanon at a time when many Arab leaders have taken initiatives reviving prospects of negotiations for peace in the Middle East. Israel has responded to these new initiatives not only by rejecting them out of hand but also by intensifying its repression in the lands it occupies. Israeli actions serve to diminish the hope that a negotiated peace settlement is achievable. Israel's refusal to provide a definitive time frame for its complete withdrawal from southern Lebanon has caused a deadlock in the Naqoura talks, making its pronouncement of withdrawals suspect and betraying a design on its part to maintain its stranglehold over parts of Lebanese territory.

103. There is no denying the fact that the alternative to a negotiated settlement is an increasing spiral of violence and bloodshed in which the aggressor will not escape retribution and suffering. It is also clear that the indispensable condition for a negotiated settlement is a speedy Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories. Israel has the choice of securing peace by returning the occupied territories to their lawful Arab and Palestinian owners. This is the basis of the latest Arab initiative for peace, embodied in the recent agreement reached between King Hussein of Jordan and Chairman Yasser Arafat of the PLO. The same condition is implicit in several Security Council resolutions, whether relating to Lebanon or to the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967.

104. The campaign of terror unleashed in southern Lebanon damages the credibility of the assumption that Israel could be made to terminate its occupation through a negotiated settlement. Israel has paid little heed to the repeated demands of the international community, including those of the Council, for the withdrawal of its troops from Lebanon. Its behaviour shows no sensitivity to world opinion or norms of international law. Hitherto the determined struggle of the Lebanese population alone has been responsible for frustrating Israel's expansionist ambitions, which were barely concealed at the time of its invasion.

105. In response to the complaint made by Lebanon, the least the Council can do is to remind Israel of the Council's demand for its immediate and unconditional withdrawal from Lebanese territory to the international border and strict compliance with the 1949 Geneva Conventions.[2] The adoption of the draft resolution which has been presented by Lebanon [*S/17000*] would serve this purpose. It would also send a clear message to Israel of the illegality of its occupation of southern Lebanon and of the censure of its repression by the international community. Obstruction of this draft resolution will not protect Israel from the rising militancy against its occupation, nor will it becalm the accompanying violence. It will only deal a blow to the current peace effort, which needs to be sustained by all those desirous of seeking a peaceful solution of the Middle East conflict.

106. I take this opportunity to express the solidarity of the Government and the people of Pakistan with the Government and the people of Lebanon in their struggle to free their country from foreign occupation, and to express also the confidence that their heroic struggle will be crowned with success.

107. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the Sudan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

108. Mr. OMER (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation has learned with deep sorrow of the passing away of the Soviet leader, Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. While sharing the sorrow of the members of the Soviet delegation at the passing away of Mr. Chernenko, we wish, through them, to convey our sincere condolences to the Soviet people on their great loss.

109. I wish at the outset to express my delegation's congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for this month. Your well-known capability and skill will be of great help to the Council in discharging its serious and important tasks in the best possible manner.

110. I am pleased to express my appreciation to your predecessor, Mr. Krishnan, the representative of India, for his competence and efficiency in guiding the work of the Council last month.

111. I wish to thank the members of the Council for having allowed me to participate in the Council's discussion of an issue that is of importance to all States that cherish peace based on justice for all. This issue is of particular importance to my country and the other Arab countries, because it is directly linked to the rights of Lebanon, a fraternal Arab country. Since 1982, that country has been suffering from the consequences of the reckless Israeli invasion and from the continued aggressive occupation of a large portion of its national territory in utter disregard of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the international conventions prohibiting the use of force against the territorial integrity and national independence of any State.

112. My delegation finds no more graphic and vivid picture of the inhuman Israeli practices against the civilian population in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district than that contained in the statement of the representative of Lebanon at the outset of the Council's deliberations on this item [*2568th meeting*]. He gave a detailed account of those violations, which include the siege and invasion of villages, the ransacking of houses, the detention of innocent people and the humiliation of the civilian population, to name but a few.

113. There is no doubt that all those practices constitute a flagrant violation of all international rules and conventions, in particular the fourth Geneva Convention.[1] Furthermore, they constitute a continued violation of the sovereignty and independence of Lebanon. We do not believe that the Council and the international community need further explanation to be convined. Israel's record in Lebanon and in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories has been well-known to the world for more than 30 years.

114. We have heard the representative of Israel enumerating repeated pretexts in an attempt to defend indefensible practices. Israel, which is an occupying Power, has put itself voluntarily in a situation where it necessarily faces the natural reaction of a people whose land has been invaded and whose national sovereignty has been violated. The heroic struggle of the people of Lebanon is a holy duty that all peoples have taken up to combat aggression, invasion and the ensuing arbitrary and inhuman practices.

115. The inhuman Israeli practices against the civilian population in Lebanon, which have in recent days increased in their barbarism and ferocity, are not new. They are an issue to which this body and the international community cannot turn a deaf ear, if we want justice and right to prevail.

116. In view of what I have said, and in order to reaffirm the Council's authority in maintaining international peace and security and to compel Israel to respect the Charter and the principles of international law and the international conventions governing the conduct of States in times of war and peace, it is incumbent upon this body to live up to its duties enshrined in the Charter in order for it to put an end to Israel's persistent aggressive practices.

117. My delegation unreservedly supports Lebanon's legitimate demands which have been put before it by its representative when he called upon the Council to implement its previous resolutions concerning the full and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territories, the immediate cessation of the Israeli practices against the civilian population of the region under Israeli occupation and the reaffirmation of strict respect for the independence, national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

118. We are confident that the Council will heed those legitimate demands and will take measures to protect the international principles that made this body the guardian of peace and security throughout the world.

119. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Czechoslovakia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

120. Mr. CÉSAR (Czechoslovakia): The Soviet people and all those who are aware of the value of peace have suffered a great loss in the death of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. Allow me to extend our profound condolences to the delegations of the Soviet Union, the Ukraine and Byelorussia. Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko was an outstanding politician and statesman. The historic successes achieved by Soviet society are inseparably connected with his work. He consistently pursued the peace policy of the Soviet Union, striving for the reduction of international tension and for the establishment of confidence and understanding in relations among States. I wish to recall in this connection the words in which he called for the peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems:

> "It is our opinion that it is imperative fully to use for these goals all available instruments, of course including the United Nations, which was founded for the very purpose of maintaining and strengthening peace."

121. Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on the assumption of the presidency. As regards the activities of the Council, the month during which you are fulfilling the duties of this office has been very demanding from the beginning. I should like to express our conviction that your experience, professional abilities and political wisdom will be of great help to the Council in successfully achieving solutions to the serious and extraordinarily dangerous international political problems.

122. I also wish to express appreciation for the constructive and responsible work of Mr. Krishnan, the representative of India, as President of the Council during the month of February.

123. The Council is now considering yet another in a long series of complaints about the practices of Israel against the civilian population in the Arab territories occupied by that State. Attention is once again focused on Israel's illegal activities directed against the inhabitants of southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district.

124. Statements that have been heard here have contained facts testifying to the increase in scope and degree of the dangerousness of the violence perpetrated by Israel against the Lebanese population since the beginning of the illegal occupation of Lebanon. The ever-growing toll of human lives gives an extraordinarily strong warning signal to the United Nations, and primarily to the Security Council.

125. The Czechoslovak people, which follows with concern the destiny of the people of Lebanon, on 7 March issued, through their Committee of Solidarity, a statement on the latest developments in Lebanon, resolutely condemning the racialist practices of the Zionist circles of Israel used by the occupying troops against the Arab population in southern Lebanon. The statement also condemns the Israeli Government for its prospectless policy of brutal violence and attacks against the population of the territories occupied during the barbaric aggression against Lebanon in 1982. The Czechoslovak people also expressed their admiration for the extensive and successful movement of resistance of the Arab people against the aggressor.

126. The developments in southern Lebanon require that the international community adopt effective measures which would provide for the speedy liberation of Lebanon and the restoration of its State sovereignty and territorial integrity. In the United Nations, an end should be put to the cynical and malicious demagoguery of the representatives of Israel, whose Government is responsible for, among other things, the atrocious massacres at Sabra and Shatila, the murder and torture of the population in the south of Lebanon and other flagrant violations of the fundamental rights of the population of southern Lebanon. Nor should the attacks of the Israeli soldiery on the United Nations units sent to Lebanon on a peace-keeping mission and the depreciation of the authority of the United Nations and its agencies be allowed to take place with impunity.

127. It is necessary that each State member of the Security Council be guided in the search for suitable measures by the fact that Israel is an aggressor within the terms of the Definition of Aggression of 14 December 1974 [*General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), annex*] and that it flagrantly violates the norms of international law, including the fourth Geneva Convention[1] and, primarily, the Charter of the United Nations. It must be recognized that such a state of affairs poses a threat not only to Lebanon but also to peace and security in the Middle East and all over the world. To turn aside from the struggle against this aggressiveness and hostility, or even to support it, would be to take the side of injustice.

128. I should like in this connection to recall the unfortunate consequences, so well known to all of us, of the failure of the Council to adopt the humanitarian measures requested by Lebanon a half-year ago [*2556th meeting*]. We call upon the representatives of the United States this time to take the side of the just cause, not that of gross unlawfulness, and not to stand in opposition to the other members of the Council and the desires of all peace-loving forces.

129. We resolutely demand that the Government of Israel, a State Member of the Organization, refrain from acts of State terrorism and violations of the duties of an occupying Power as stipulated in the fourth Geneva Convention, that it responsibly co-operate with the Lebanese Government in the organization of the withdrawal of the occupying forces and give up right now speculations about future interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon.

130. We appreciate the fact that the statement of the representative of Lebanon contained an unamibiguous expression of willingness to engage in constructive co-operation with Israel in the organization of the evacuation of the Israeli troops. Such an approach constitutes the only way to achieve the much needed implementation of Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which demand that Israel immediately and unconditionally bring its armed forces back across the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon. This is the only way for termination of the illegal occupation of Lebanon.

131. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Israel. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

132. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): For students of the international situation, one might even say of the human condition, this has been a most instructive session. A number of speakers have outdone each other in anti-Israeli rhetoric for our alleged misdeeds in south Lebanon.

133. We have heard, for example, from the representative of South Yemen. I suppose it was probably too much to hope that the representative of that amiable régime at Aden, a haven and training-ground for terrorists from a dozen countries, would refrain from speaking.

134. We have heard from the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, which, while denouncing us, at least spared us a lecture on the need to respect the independence of nations.

135. Then there was Cuba, that island of tranquillity, whose troops are now busily minding their own business in East and West Africa—not to mention their well-armed emissaries of goodwill in this hemisphere.

136. And then we heard from Viet Nam, a country that occupied Cambodia with 200,000 troops and Laos with 50,000, and is currently crushing both countries underfoot. It chose to lecture Israel about the evils of occupation.

137. And then there is Nicaragua, whose benevolent campaign against the defenceless Mesquito Indians no doubt qualifies it to talk of atrocities.

138. And then there is East Germany, whose soldiers are obediently goose-stepping to the Soviet tune in foreign

climes. The representative of that totalitarian régime dares to invoke public opinion.

139. What have these paragons of international virtue been telling us? Their repeated message is this: Israel has no right to defend itself, even when withdrawing from Lebanon. It should not defend its soldiers, it should not defend its civilians. When ambushed and bombed, it is to do nothing. It is not permitted to track terrorists back to their lairs. It is not even permitted to prevent car bombs from crossing the border and blowing up women and children.

140. For just two day ago, the Islamic-Jihad of Lebanon, a front group for various extremist Shiite organizations, made an announcement. They said that the car bomb used against an Israeli convoy—a convoy, mind you, leaving Lebanon—was actually intended for use against the Israeli town of Metulla, a few hundred yards across the border.

141. These people have made it clear that their ultimate targets, besides Lebanese from other groups, are the men, women and children of Israel. If the declared intention to use car bombs against civilians is not terrorism, then nothing is.

142. We will never accept the principle that we cannot defend ourselves against such attacks. We will continue to track our attackers back to their havens, confiscate their weapons and thwart their plans to murder us.

143. This was exactly our action yesterday in Zarariyah. What we heard from the representative of Lebanon about that action was flatly, completely false. This village was the target neither of a reprisal nor of a random sweep—precisely the opposite. The Israel Defence Forces had received reliable intelligence that a large group of armed terrorists was preparing to launch further attacks against us from that village. This, incidentally, corroborated other information that traced to that village many recent attacks.

144. Indeed, when our forces entered Zarariyah they were met with a hail of gunfire and even RPG rockets. They responded with fire and pursued several dozen fleeing terrorists, some of whom were in vehicles loaded with weapons and explosives. In the ensuing battle, over 30 terrorists were killed and several dozen were captured. Seven were wounded and treated by Israeli medics—not exactly fitting, to put it mildly, the colourful language of atrocity used so glibly by some speakers yesterday.

145. In addition, we uncovered an enormous amount of weapons, explosives and mines—caches unusually large even for southern Lebanon. So much for an attack on a "peaceful and defenceless" village.

146. This is a good illustration of the way in which Israel's actions against its attackers are exaggerated and distorted beyond belief. I do not have the time here to rebut the whole stream of falsehoods that have been uttered in the course of this debate. But, beyond mere distortion, there is outright fabrication. Groups in Lebanon have been killing each other with abandon for many years now. This does not prevent them, or others, from falsely accusing us of their mutual atrocities.

147. I mentioned earlier in this debate the preposterous accusation that we were responsible for the bomb at M'arakah. Let me take a moment to address an even more ludicrous charge. A few days ago a bomb went off outside a mosque at Beirut, as such bombs have been doing for the last decade. Israel and the United States were immediately accused, without the slightest evidence, of setting it off.

148. But we do know, for example, that Sheikh Fadlallah, a major Shiite leader affiliated with Iran, was summoned to Damascus recently. He was apparently told to stop agitating for a Khomeini-style Islamic republic in Lebanon, which is not exactly agreeable to the present régime in Damascus. But Fadlallah ignored Syria's demands. A few days ago a car bomb exploded next to the Mosque, just yards away from his home, wounding some of his bodyguards. Now, no one here has even bothered to mention the most likely perpetrator of that bombing—Syria, which having imported into Lebanon the Khomeini fanatics, now worries that it will lose control over them.

149. So it makes no difference whether Israel's forces are in the area, have recently left the area, or are far away from an area of Lebanon. Whatever happens, no matter where it happens, Israel, it seems, is going to be accused.

150. While the various Lebanese factions—and, behind them, Damascus and Teheran—can agree on nothing else, they all lend their voices to a harmony of hate against Israel. And Beirut, which is vassalized by Syria and frightened by Iran's surrogates, has decided to join this chorus. It repeats the false accusations against Israel and brings them even to this chamber.

151. By now no one expects heroic defiance of Syria from Beirut. But it might at least refrain from outbidding others in inciting fanaticism and terrorism. The Government of Lebanon will soon face the domestic consequences of fanning such extremism.

152. As for attacks on Israel and its citizens, we shall hold Lebanon responsible for failing to live up to its international obligations, the obligations of that very sovereignty which it so noisily invoked yesterday.

153. What would the adoption of this draft resolution [*S/17000*] do? First, let me tell you what it would not do: it would not stop Israel from defending its men, women and children against attack. But what it would do is to encourage the forces of fanaticism and extremism in southern Lebanon. It would cost lives, including those of Lebanese—lives lost to an emboldened terrorism. And it would be a truly historic surrender to blackmail by members of the Security Council. So those who are really concerned with peace must not take part in this exercise. It can only embolden the men of terror in Lebanon.

154. But, of course, most of those who support this draft resolution deliberately seek precisely that outcome. A few,

for their own reasons, mistakenly joined them. They, too, will share in the responsibility for what happens as a result.

155. So what we have here is not a campaign to keep Lebanon free or fairly apportion blame. What we have seen here is another chapter in the campaign to make Lebanon, the Middle East—indeed, the world—safe for hypocrisy.

156. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic has asked to speak. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

157. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I had not intended to take part in this debate, and should not have sought to do so but for the fact that the Israeli representative intervened in order to mislead members of the Council and to insult those who have here defended Lebanon and the right of the Lebanese people to defend itself.

158. Allow me, Mr. President, to express to the Soviet delegation our sorrow and grief on the passing away of Mr. Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union. We knew Comrade Chernenko as a faithful leader and supporter of peoples' liberation movements and as a prominent statesman. He contributed to fostering friendly relations between our countries in various fields. We knew him as a fighter for socialism and for the liberation of countries, and we hail his services to his country, his Government, the 1917 Revolution and the alliance of all peoples against imperialism, colonialism and aggression.

159. Allow me, Sir, to express to you at the outset our appreciation for your assumption of the presidency for this month. We are confident that your long experience in diplomacy here at the United Nations, in addition to your country's constructive role in international affairs, will help the Council to do justice to the suffering peoples of many countries, in the first place the Arab peoples in Lebanon, Palestine and the occupied Arab territories, as well as the African peoples of southern Africa.

160. On this occasion we should like to express our sincere congratulations to the representative of India on his presidency of the Council in February and on the exemplary manner of energy, wisdom and objectivity with which he guided the Council's work during that month.

161. I wish to make some preliminary remarks on the subject of this debate. The statements of the Israeli representative and of a permanent member of the Council have compelled us once more to intervene out of concern that the Council act justly as the body bearing responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. This Council is the first resort of those countries whose independence and territorial integrity are threatened. In accordance with its mandate, the Council can employ the machinery of collective security as a means of removing any act of aggression or threat of force. It is on that basis that we, and other States, have resorted to the protection of the Security Council, because of our acceptance, since the signing of the Charter of the United Nations, that it was the Council that was to limit the use of force, through measures adopted by the Council. Unfortunately, it has failed to carry out its duties and responsibilities. This has led to the perpetuation of situations totally inimical to the Charter, in particular situations threatening the maintenance of international peace and security, the termination of aggression and the exercise by peoples of their right to self-determination. Thus the Council has failed to carry out the aims of the Charter and has become but a place in which to present complaints and nothing more—an arena for manoeuvres in which the weak are the losers. Instead of doing justice to the victims, the Security Council fosters *faits accomplis* resulting from aggression.

162. The question of Palestine, which has been discussed since 1948, proves what I have just said, because Israel and its allies, primarily the United States, have succeeded, through the exploitation of the Council, in rewarding the aggressor and undermining peoples' right to self-determination and brilliantly—I repeat, brilliantly—tipped the scale in favour of the aggressor. Thus the right to resist is the natural and only proper means open to peoples in the circumstances prevailing in the Council; the ideal means to put an end to aggression and to regain usurped rights. According to the pertinent principles of international law and under Article 51 of the Charter, this is the right of peoples.

163. We hope that this time the United States will not hamper the work of the Council and that it will co-operate with all the members that have spoken here out of their concern for international peace and security.

164. The magnificent struggle waged and the sacrifices endured by the heroic Lebanese people are the direct result of the fact that the United States has not enabled the Security Council to implement its resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), for if the United States had been faithful to its declared intentions when it voted in favour of those resolutions, the Council would have been able to implement them immediately and unconditionally. But it has become clear that the United States vote in favour of both resolutions, and in particular resolution 509 (1982), was misleading and was aimed only at gaining time to help Israel in blackmailing Lebanon in the attempt to obliterate its identity and place it at the service of Israel's ambitions in the region.

165. But the Lebanese people has risen against the 17 May 1983 accord, concluded under military pressure, and caused it to be abrogated. Even now Washington is seeking gains for Israel, as it did in the last meeting. Israel's refusal to submit a plan and a timetable for its withdrawal during the Naqoura talks—talks which the United States Administration pretended to support—was but a means to gain time and ultimately to create conditions in and outside Lebanon that, according to its miscalculations, could somehow exact a pound of flesh from Lebanon. Since the last meeting of the Security Council, Israel has expanded

its inhuman terrorist practices against civilians in southern Lebanon as well as in Beirut itself, as opposed to what the representative of Israel said just a few minutes ago. There have been hundreds of casualties as a result of those incidents, all of which are meant to hamper the efforts of the Lebanese factions that seek to restore stability and security in the north, south, east and west of Lebanon.

166. Israel is interested only in undermining those efforts and in diverting attention from its defeat in its war against Lebanon. It is in Israel's interest to impede Lebanese endeavours to reconstruct its security, economy and society. Israel is reacting to its military and political defeat through operations that aim at aggravating the situation, but we are certain that it will not succeed in its purpose because the Lebanon of 1985 is not the Lebanon of 1975. The Lebanon of 1985 is the Lebanon of conciliation; it is the Lebanon of solidarity against the common enemy, which is Israel. The recent participation of the Lebanese army in resisting the barbaric operations against civilians in southern Lebanon clearly reflects the change in the quality of the national resistance aimed at the unconditional evacuation of Israeli troops.

167. Despite all this, the representative of Israel today tried, as he has tried in the past on more than one occasion, to give the impression that the Syrian presence in Lebanon is a kind of occupation imposed upon Lebanon. But the Israeli representative, the United States and every country in the world recognize that the Syrian presence in Lebanon came about at the request of the legitimate Lebanese authority to help it achieve its noble aims, primarily that of maintaining Lebanon's territorial integrity, security and stability. The Syrian-Lebanese co-operation in the rescue process, in conciliation and in the implementation of the security plan, which today covers most of Lebanese territory, is under way with the consent of all Lebanese parties.

168. The Israeli representative alleged at the last meeting that, despite all this, Syria occupies 60 per cent of Lebanese territory. If Israel's statements deceive some, the Lebanese know who is the true enemy and which Arab country is first to do its utmost to restore security and stability through a constructive and fruitful dialogue and concrete actions to help it. The Israeli representative knows that truth, which is painful to him. If he does not know that truth, it is because political illiteracy is prevalent in the imported Zionist entity. That entity has been provided by the United States with all kinds of respiratory machinery to keep its blood circulation going.

169. The United States delegation is fervently trying to abort the draft resolution contained in document S/17000, which is in conformity with and along the same lines as resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), which were adopted unanimously. I hope that I am wrong in my analysis. I sincerely hope that the United States will not exercise its right of veto against this humanitarian draft resolution.

170. Those efforts are being made at a time when Israel implements with unlimited ferocity—stemming from its inherent aggressive instincts as a colonial entity—its barbaric policies against the civilian population which have been described by Rabin, the Defence Minister, as the "iron fist" policy. These have been accompanied by the United States applying pressure through "heavy handed" policies legalized by United States jurisdiction that have been a principle of United States relations with independent countries.

171. The United States rides roughshod over its responsibilities under the Charter as a permanent member of the Council. It now imposes individual sanctions against any entity in the world which does not support American positions, whether in the United Nations or in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. At the same time, we are aware that the United States—as is its practice—obstructs any attempt to impose collective sanctions against the *apartheid* régime in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, despite universal support of that step to protect millions of black Africans against slavery, detention, arrests, the creation of bantustans and forced exile, imposed on them by the minority régime of Pretoria.

172. At the 2570th meeting, we listened to the representative of the United States say that, according to sources in Beirut, there are threats "specifically linked to our actions in the Security Council . . . to influence the participation and vote of the United States in this body" and that "the United States therefore calls on all members of the Council to repudiate the threats against the deliberative process of the Council".

173. All these allegations, true or false, have nothing to do with the crux of the Lebanese complaint which is before us. They are aimed at giving the impression that the Council is under coercion while discussing Lebanon's complaint. But we all know that the Council adopted very important resolutions while the Zionist leaders here in the United States—American nationals—with the participation of the United States, have been exerting all kinds of pressure and threats to deny the Palestinian people its unity, independence and international identity which were recognized under the British Mandate.

174. If we believe the American argument that coercion is exerted in the Council, then resolution 69 (1949), in which the Council described Israel as a peace-loving State, was wrested by coercion, in as much as it had been preceded by Israeli massacres against the Palestinian civilian population and by the assassination of United Nations Mediator Count Folke Bernadotte and his French assistant. Was not the attack against the spy ship *Liberty* and the killing of hundreds of Americans an Israeli intimidation of the United States while the Security Council met day and night to achieve a cease-fire in that year?

175. If we accept that United States "logic", does it not mean that the Council has considered the question of Nicaragua under pressure of the United States Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), which is operating in Nicaraguan territory to topple the legitimate Government and rob the Sandinist revolution of its national gains? Does all that not mean that the economic intimidation practised by the United States Administration against some States which

face food shortages will prevent those countries from turning to the Security Council for fear of the American threat to discontinue food aid?

176. Let us be frank: the American statement was intended to justify possible American opposition—which we hope will not materialize—to a humanitarian draft resolution and to label as heroic a position inconsistent with the humanitarian principles called for by the Washington Administration. It is also a pretext to move its fleets in the Mediterranean from west to east.

177. I should like to add that those who suffer from continued threat and intimidation live temporarily in New York in the service of their country, not the other way round.

178. As usual, the representative of the Zionist entity has tried to mislead the Council. He said that the Israeli Army is withdrawing from Lebanon, not entering Lebanon, and that that Army therefore has the right to defend itself using all means. But the representative of Israel ignores the fact that the occupation itself is an act of aggression and that the resistance is thus exercising its natural right of driving the invaders out, whether they are withdrawing from or storming the country. The European resistance to the Nazis fought the invaders, whether they were coming into or leaving their countries. The criterion is the foreign presence on Lebanese territory, not the intentions of the Israeli strategies and tactics.

179. The Israeli representative forgot that the Lebanese resistance to the Israeli invaders did not start with the withdrawal of the invasion; its seeds were sown on the first day of Israel's sweep across Lebanon, on 6 June 1982.

180. The Israeli Prime Minister stated, through the Hebrew-language radio service in its news broadcast of 26 February 1985, that:

> "The withdrawal will be decided upon according to various factors, among them the establishment of a security zone in the north, the protection of troops of the Israel Defence Forces and the battle against the terrorism of the Shiites."

181. Can any Council member see in this withdrawal anything but the building of a road on which Israel will return to Lebanon?

182. According to what we have read out, the Israeli withdrawal is being carried out on conditions set by Israel alone, in keeping with its aggressive intentions. The populations of the occupied territories, the target of the inhuman practices of the Israeli forces, know very well that Israel is strengthening its strongholds and positions in southern Lebanon. Israel, therefore, cannot expect the resistance to cease just because it has declared its intention to withdraw. It is impossible to believe that this withdrawal could not be carried out without the inhuman practices perpetrated by Israel: the laying siege to villages, the killing of children, women and the elderly, the blowing up of places of worship and social institutions, deportation, the demolition of dwellings, and inspections which have been extended to every house, every hut.

183. By the terms of the fourth Geneva Convention,[1] the demolition of houses, the besieging of towns, the torture of civilians, and the inhuman and uncivilized treatment meted out to the villagers and other inhabitants are war crimes. The representative of Israel has attempted to mislead the Council by invoking the concept of self-defence, trying to interpret that term in a way which contradicts its true meaning. For Israel, the right of self-defence has come to mean the right to wage pre-emptive wars, breaking into houses, killing, displacement, and terrorist practices against civilians. It means deploying even more troops on the occupied Lebanese territory. Does self-defence require perpetrating horrible crimes such as that committed on a mosque situated on the outskirts of Beirut, claiming more than 80 civilian lives? The Israeli concept of self-defence permits retaliation, as explained by Shamir, the Israeli Foreign Minister, quoted in the newspaper *Le Monde* and on French radio on 26 February 1985 as follows:

> "We are absolutely determined to teach them that Israel will put an end to their activities by every possible means, including means we have hitherto not used."*

184. Does that statement mean that the blowing up of the mosque in Beirut and the events of yesterday and the day before in southern Lebanon have been carried out through means not before used by Israel? We know that such means as the demolition of houses of worship, including the mosque in Beirut, and the killing of civilians have been traditionally employed by Israel since its inception, out of hatred for the Arabs and everything that is Arabic.

185. There is another statement by Shamir I should not like to see reproduced in the records of this Council, for it contains an attack against a State which is a permanent member of the Council. Syria cannot put on record those dirty words uttered by Shamir and reported by French radio in Paris.

186. I apologize for taking up so much of the Council's time; I know that the hour is late. The aim of this statement is to dot the i's. There have been manoeuvres here to mislead the Council, and I wish to reaffirm Syria's support for the people and the Government of Lebanon and to state that we shall continue to support Lebanon until it regains its strength, to enable that country to live in peace within its internationally recognized boundaries.

187. Mr. BASSOLE (Burkina Faso) (*interpretation from French*): We were shocked to learn yesterday morning the sad news of the death of Konstantin Chernenko, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. His death comes at a time when international peace and security—the peace and security to which he dedicated his life—are more than ever threatened. In recent weeks, this has been borne out by the

* Quoted by the speaker in English.

armed conflicts which are under way in various regions of the world, compelling our Council to meet almost ceaselessly. As the leader of a great Power, the deceased bore a special responsibility for the future of mankind. On behalf of the National Revolutionary Council and of the Government and the people of Burkina Faso, I express to the Soviet delegation our heartfelt condolences, and request the Soviet delegation to convey them to its Government and to the family of the deceased.

188. My delegation wishes to speak at this stage of our deliberations for the following reason. In her statement before the Council [*2570th meeting*], the representative of the United States drew the attention of us all to a fact whose importance and gravity have not escaped us. This uncomfortable situation in which a State Member of the Organization—indeed, a member of the Security Council—finds itself because of the opinions it holds should be of concern to the Council, first, because we firmly believe that matters before the Council should be debated with no pressure brought to bear from any quarter on any member. Further we believe that in all matters the Council should show moderation and avoid extremism, lest it become more and more difficult for the Council to put an end, through adequate and universally acceptable solutions, to hotbeds of tension throughout the world. Finally, we believe in the virtues of persuasion by force of argument. Our words should in no way cast doubt on or call into question our commitment to defend the just cause of the fraternal people of Lebanon. We merely felt that it would be appropriate and useful to share these ideas with the other members of the Council along with our concern about our chances of finding solutions to problems which are made thornier by certain activities.

189. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): There are no other names on the list of speakers. I now have the intention to put to the vote the draft resolution in document S/17000.

190. I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

191. Mr. MOHAMMED (Trinidad and Tobago): First, I should like on behalf of the Government and people of Trinidad and Tobago to convey our deepest sympathy and condolences to the Government and people of the Soviet Union on the untimely death of Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. Our condolences go also to the bereaved family.

192. We have been following the recent tragic events in Lebanon with utmost concern. We welcome the decision by the Government of Israel to withdraw all its forces from Lebanon to the internationally recognized boundaries. We have also noted that the Israeli Government has approved the second phase of its withdrawal. We are, however, very concerned by reports of the increased violence accompanying its withdrawal—reports of the death of innocent civilians, imposition of restrictions, imprisonment, human degradation and general devastation. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago cannot condone either the earlier violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon or the more recently reported violations of the people and their land.

193. I turn now to the draft resolution before the Council. My delegation would have liked to see one or two more constructive, one or two more forward-looking, elements incorporated in the draft resolution. For example, we should have liked to see an appeal made to all parties involved to exercise restraint during the process of withdrawal, an appeal made to all parties to refrain from the use of violence, as in our view this would facilitate and expedite the process of withdrawal. And we should have liked to see an appeal made to all parties to demonstrate some mutual forbearance.

194. We feel that both Israel and Lebanon could usefully engage in consultations and discussions aimed at working out the modalities that would ensure a peaceful withdrawal. We feel that these consultations might also provide a forum and an opportunity to draw up a programme and timetable for the total and complete withdrawal. We feel that such consultations might yield insights into the subsequent requirements for the maintenance of law and order in the evacuated areas. Such consultations might also indicate possibilities for an enhanced role for United Nations peace-keeping operations.

195. My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution before the Council, but we should like to place it on record that we have interpreted the purport of the draft resolution in the manner I have just outlined. We are also appealing to both Israel and Lebanon to pay due regard to our suggestions.

196. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): On behalf of the United States delegation and of the United States in its role as host Government to the United Nations, I should like to convey to the Soviet delegation the sincere condolences of my Government on the occasion of the death of the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. We should also like our condolences to be extended to his family.

197. At a time when representatives of our two Governments are about to begin discussions in Geneva on ways to reduce and finally eliminate the danger of nuclear war, this solemn occasion reminds us of the grave responsibilities which we bear for the maintenance and strengthening of world peace. The decision of the Soviet and United States delegations in Geneva to begin their discussions on schedule despite the passing of Chairman Chernenko demonstrates, I think, the commitment of both our countries to this process.

198. I should also like to extend the condolences of the United States delegation and of the United States in its role as host country to the family and the Government of Prime Minister Tom Adams of Barbados, who has died only today. Prime Minister Adams gave distinguished, courageous and democratic leadership to Barbados, and we greatly regret his loss.

199. The United States regrets that it is confronted here in the Council with a draft resolution which it cannot support. My country is in fact deeply committed to peace for the people of Lebanon and sovereignty for the Government of Lebanon. The United States would greatly prefer to join in a consensus resolution which commits this body to a sincere effort to deal with the problems of Lebanon, while respecting the rights of all States Members of the United Nations. We should have been happy to join in negotiations to the end of achieving such a consensus resolution and, in a spirit of good faith and goodwill, to have worked to find a formulation that addresses the needs of Lebanon and the possibilities for peace.

200. Indeed, the United States is still ready to join in a statement that reflects the dismay of the Council at the escalation of violence in Lebanon; expresses our deepest sympathy to the victims of that violence; urges restraint on all parties; calls on all parties to implement the recommendations contained in the Secretary-General's report; affirms the application of the fourth Geneva Convention[1] to the occupied areas of Lebanon; reaffirms our commitment and that of all members to the full restoration of Lebanon's sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and unity. We also should be happy to join in an action by the Council which took some account of the threats of violence aimed at these deliberative processes.

201. Unfortunately, the Government of Lebanon was uninterested in an approach which would have had the support of all members of the Council and, instead, came to the Council with a draft resolution it declined to modify in any way. We regret that the Government of Lebanon declined to discuss the text. We regret that the Government of Lebanon presented an unbalanced draft resolution in the first place.

202. The United States Government has worked long and hard and very sincerely to assist in securing the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon. We support the Secretary-General's report. We support the Naqoura talks for an orderly withdrawal of Israeli forces.

203. The United States Government worked hard and in good faith to create conditions that would restore full sovereignty to the Government of Lebanon and the control of all of Lebanon's territory to the people of Lebanon. Our efforts, alas, have met with no success so far. The tragic cycle of violence in Lebanon continues. Peace has not been brought to Lebanon because too many parties in and around Lebanon have preferred conquest to peace. Foreign troops and foreign groups are still in Lebanon and join warring indigenous factions in drenching that tragic land in blood. There is a cycle of violence in Lebanon, and that fact is not altered by its denial in the Council.

204. The United States believes that this draft resolution does not accord Israel fair treatment. We believe this debate has not accorded Israel fair treatment. We believe it has not respected the realities of Lebanon. We are disturbed that the lack of fairness apparently does not embarrass many members of the Council. The fact is, Members of the United Nations have a habit, in the Council, of accusing Israel of the most extraordinary crimes. It has not been very long since a long list of speakers accused the Government of Israel of poisoning thousands of Arab schoolgirls, but investigation by international health authorities found no evidence of that poisoning. On another occasion, the Government of Israel was accused of wanton murder of refugees in Ein el-Hilweh, but objective investigation established that no murder had taken place. I cite these examples, not to exculpate Israel of any wrongdoing, but to point to the profound and persistent hostility to Israel which is repeatedly manifested in the Council. That hostility, which singles out the State of Israel, is manifest even when the Council confronts violence done to Israel. That hostility, unfortunately, leads, I believe, to unbalanced decisions—unbalanced resolutions.

205. The draft resolution before us today is, I think, such an unbalanced draft resolution. We believe that it applies double standards; indeed, we believe that double standards have dominated the deliberations, as we believe that "double-speak" was the *lingua franca* of much of this debate. We note that the representative of Viet Nam, whose 200,000 troops wreak war on the people of Cambodia, is concerned about the presence of foreign troops in Lebanon. We note that Cuba, which has foreign troops stationed in a dozen countries in the world, is concerned about the violation of the sovereignty of Lebanon. We note that the PLO condemns violence here—Israeli violence, of course. We note that it was Syria which assured us of how happy Lebanon is to have Syrian troops in Lebanon.

206. The United States supports—ardently supports—the withdrawal of all Israeli troops from Lebanon. We have worked to that end; we will do so in the future. The United States sincerely supported resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), and we sincerely supported, then and now, the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Lebanon and the enjoyment of full sovereignty by Lebanon. The United States opposed Israel's entering Lebanon in the beginning. We fully support the applicability to Lebanon's occupied territories of the fourth Geneva Convention.[1]

207. But we cannot acquiesce in this draft resolution because we do not believe an unbalanced resolution will end the agony of Lebanon. The United States believes it is not too late for the Council to reaffirm its commitment to peace in Lebanon. We believe it is not too late for the Council to engage in a serious search for constructive means to that end. In the meanwhile, the United States will vote against the draft resolution.

208. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/17000.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Burkina Faso, China, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Againt: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Denmark, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The result of the vote was 11 in favour, one against and 3 abstentions. The draft resolution was not adopted, the negative vote being that of a permanent member of the Council.

209. Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom): I wish first to convey to our Soviet colleagues, to their Government, to the family and to the people of the USSR my delegation's sincere condolences on the death of Mr. Konstantin Chernenko, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet.

210. In my speech to the Council last Thursday [*2570th meeting*], I emphasized the need for the Council to promote a diplomatic solution to the growing violence in southern Lebanon and to do nothing which could further inflame that violence. This approach has been a guiding factor in our attitude to the draft resolution.

211. Before turning to the details of the draft, I should like to associate my delegation with those who have stressed the unacceptability of threats to United Nations personnel. This is a matter of great significance to the United Nations as a whole and cannot be passed over in silence.

212. There are a number of elements in the draft resolution which we support, in particular its operative paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 7. We strongly support the Council's calls for the complete withdrawal of all Israeli forces from Lebanon and for strict respect for the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. We consider that Israel, as the occupying Power, and the Israeli military authorities, are duty-bound to respect and uphold the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention[1] and of other norms of international law. We wish to see all the parties concerned cooperate with the Secretary-General in promoting orderly arrangements for the early withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon.

213. We regret, however, that the draft resolution, despite the positive aspects I have mentioned, takes insufficient account of the need to dampen the cycle of violence, which has been given a new and ghastly twist over the weekend, and to promote the peaceful diplomatic solution so urgently needed. In particular there is no mention in the draft resolution of the role of UNIFIL or of the need to assist the Secretary-General's efforts in pursuance of Council resolution 555 (1984) and to encourage an immediate return to the Naqoura talks. We believe that in the present circumstances it would have been better not to put it to a vote.

214. My Government therefore felt obliged to abstain.

215. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Since I spoke yesterday to express my gratitude for the expressions of condolences on the passing away of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, many other delegations have extended their sympathy to our delegation. We should like once again to say that we are extremely grateful for these expressions of condolences and sympathy and that we shall transmit them to Moscow, to our Government and to the members of the family of the deceased.

216. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Lebanon.

217. Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The result of the vote on the draft resolution did not surprise us, because when we called for the Council to be convened, we knew the different positions that would be taken, whether in favour, against or abstaining. We are not amateurs in the collection of resolutions. The Council has adopted numerous resolutions, but they have remained dead letters.

218. We have rights, and they need no consecration through the adoption of a resolution. Here we act as independent sovereign States.

219. The representative of the United States has recognized that the Government of Lebanon did not intimidate; on the contrary, it was trying to abort intimidation. The real threat is against Lebanon and against its people in the south, in western Bekaa and the Rashaya district. That was the crux of our complaint.

220. If some members had been true to themselves they would have condemned the arbitrary and inhumane practices of the occupying army, as they have already condemned the Israeli invasion. Those practices are inevitable results of that invasion, part and parcel of it. Today those members have opposed condemnation of the consequences of the invasion. The Council has failed to meet its obligations because of the American veto, and has left the populations of southern Lebanon, the Rashaya district and western Bekaa victims of the Israeli army. That veto has encouraged Israel to proceed with its brutal policies and its defiance of the Council and the international community.

221. This stand will not weaken our will; it will not affect our insistence on liberating southern Lebanon, Bekaa and Rashaya from the yoke of the Israeli occupation. We shall liberate those regions of Lebanon, which we cherish, by all means, and in the first place through legitimate national resistance, which is in accord with the resolutions of the United Nations.

222. Through thousands of years of history, Lebanon has witnessed interventions by numerous armies of occupation. Those armies are gone, but Lebanon remains.

223. The false statements of the representative of Israel deserve no reply, and therefore we shall ignore them.

224. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of this agenda item.

The meeting rose at 2.25 p.m.

NOTES

[1] Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949 (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973).

[2] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, Nos. 970-973.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة . قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York

00400

90-61439—June 1994—1,925

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2574th MEETING: 12 MARCH 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2574)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The question of South Africa: Letter dated 28 February 1985 from the Deputy Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16991)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2574th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 12 March 1985, at 4.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Blaise RABETAFIKA (Madagascar).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2574)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The question of South Africa:
   Letter dated 28 February 1985 from the Deputy Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16991)

The meeting was called to order at 5.15 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The question of South Africa:
Letter dated 28 February 1985 from the Deputy Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16991)

1. The PRESIDENT: (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken by the Council at its 2571st meeting, I invite the representative of Guinea to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Democratic Yemen, South Africa, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania and Viet Nam to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Touré (Guinea) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Al-Alfi (Democratic Yemen), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Lweno (United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: (*interpretation from French*): Members of the Council have before them document S/17013/Rev.1, which contains the text of a revised draft resolution submitted by Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Madagascar, Peru and Trinidad and Tobago.

3. I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of MADAGASCAR.

4. Since the entry into force of a so-called new constitution, the Pretoria authorities have been stepping up their delaying tactics to perpetuate the white minority's domination and power.

5. That is why the Pretoria régime, anxious to improve its image in the eyes of the international community and to break out of its isolation, announced a series of reforms which appeared to be in the interests of the black population and proposed to the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) the beginnings of a conditional dialogue. Regional bodies and municipal councils, elected by a small minority, have been set up in order to give the impression that black South Africans will be exercising their political rights through these new institutions. In the same way, it is intended to establish an "informal forum" which would enable blacks to discuss their political future. Another example of this was the decision to grant 16 ghettos their own police units, which would relieve white police officers of their increasingly discredited role in the alleged maintenance of order.

6. Finally, we must recall the recent offer to release Nelson Mandela and other South African political prisoners on the condition that they renounce violence as a political means, even though the United Nations, in many resolutions, has urged the Pretoria authorities to release without prior conditions all those imprisoned under the arbitrary State security laws and all those detained for their opposition to the *apartheid* régime.

7. Naturally, the black population and its leaders, the black trade unions and all opponents of *apartheid* have rejected these alleged reforms. Indeed, all these vague reformist gestures are designed only to strengthen the domination of white State power over the non-white majority, both in the political and economic spheres and in all other areas.

8. Thus, it is hardly surprising to see a strengthening of the black population's resistance to the oppressive *apartheid* régime. This resistance takes several forms. Schoolchildren continue to shun the teaching system imposed upon them; labour unions issue strike orders; and the action launched by the miners' unions on 5 and 6 November 1984 bears witness to the vitality of their movement. Ghetto dwellers refuse to be moved by force to "concentration camps" and rebel openly against the racist régime.

9. In the face of this determination of the population to fight injustice and inequality, the racist régime has unmasked itself and has begun a new escalation of repression. The police apparatus, already infamous for its blind massacres, no longer sufficed, and the South African Government called out the army to put down the rebellion of the defenceless inhabitants of Crossroads, killing some 20 victims and wounding 230.

10. The forced displacement of the inhabitants of the townships is part of the policy of bantustanization, whose ultimate goal is to prevent the formation of a South African nation, to dispossess the majority of their land, and to strengthen the political and economic domination of the white minority.

11. Worse still, on 18 February the racist authorities of South Africa, casting off their mask of peacefulness and new dialogue, arrested eight leaders of the United Democratic Front (UDF). Those leaders have now joined their eight companions-in-struggle who have been languishing in gaol since August 1984. At the same time, labour union leaders, students and leaders of mass organizations have been detained. Sixteen of them have been charged with high treason and therefore are liable to the death penalty. Thus, almost 30 years after the notorious trials of South African patriots, the methods of the racist régime have scarcely changed.

12. The international community cannot remain indifferent to the dangerous developments in South Africa. In the face of the intransigence, cruelty and continuous brutality of the *apartheid* régime, we can only reaffirm the legitimacy of the struggle of the South African people for liberation and renew our total support for the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa, under the leadership of its national liberation movement. It is encouraging to see that public opinion in the countries that are held to be allies of South Africa is becoming aware of the plight of the South African people and bringing pressure to bear on the leaders of those countries with a view to securing the effective implementation of United Nations resolutions designed to isolate South Africa.

13. My delegation is still convinced that the present situation in South Africa derives from the continued imposition of the policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination by the South African minority régime, as well as from its contemptuous dismissal of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. The members of the Council were not fooled by the arrogant and hypocritical statement of the representative of South Africa [*2571st meeting*], who denied the justification for the agenda of the present meeting. The Pretoria agent even insulted the wisdom of the Council by his sly, underhand criticism of the countries sponsoring the draft resolution before the Council. But those countries have nothing to learn from the exponents of racial discrimination and oppression. If racist South Africa wishes to be readmitted to the comity of civilized nations, it must completely eliminate the practice of *apartheid*, which is a crime against mankind.

14. My delegation pays a tribute to the oppressed people of South Africa for their heroic resistance to the *apartheid* régime and reaffirms the legitimacy of that people's struggle to eradicate the *apartheid* system in order that a united, non-racial and democratic South Africa may become a reality and not just a hypothesis or a mirage.

15. I now resume my functions as PRESIDENT.

16. The representative of Guinea wishes to make a statement as Chairman of the Group of African States for the month of March, and I now call on him.

17. Mr. TOURÉ (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): With the permission of the Council, we should like to extend to the Soviet delegation, on behalf of the Group of African States and on our own behalf, deep sympathy on the death of the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The death of Mr. Konstantin Chernenko is a great loss to the Soviet people and the peoples of the entire world. Africa has lost in Mr. Chernenko a friend in the African people's struggle against the policy of *apartheid* of the racist South African régime. We ask the Soviet delegation to be kind enough to extend to the family of the deceased and to the people and Government of the Soviet Union our deepest condolences.

18. Having said that, we wish at this stage, on behalf of the Group of African States, to thank the delegations that contributed, during the intensive consultations that took place following last Friday's meeting [*ibid.*] of the Council, to the revision of the draft resolution which we hope will be adopted unanimously by the Council. The unanimous adoption of the draft resolution by the Council will, we are sure, be a message reflecting the international community's indignation and its condemnation of the barbaric acts committed by the racist régime against the African majority and reaffirming the right of the people of South Africa to struggle by all means to regain their legitimate rights.

19. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): It is my understanding that the Council is prepared to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution now before it. If I hear no objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

20. First, I shall call on members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

21. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): The fact that for the fourth time in seven months the Council is considering a draft resolution on South Africa reflects the turmoil which continues in that country. We have recorded the United Kingdom's views during the adoption of Council resolutions 554 (1984), 556 (1984) and 558 (1984). The further spate of deaths, injury and violence, this time focused on the community of Crossroads, has provoked uniform condemnation. Likewise, the continuing exclusion of black South Africans from political life, the denial to the large majority of the population of South

Africa of the civil and political rights which, in the democratic nations, we regard as fundamental, and the policy of forced removals are deplored throughout the world. No wonder there was widespread disappointment at the statement by the representative of South Africa. It is because the United Kingdom fully shares the concern about these events already expressed by other members of the Council that we shall vote in favour of the draft resolution.

22. At the same time, we in the United Kingdom have acknowledged that some highly significant developments are taking place in South Africa. It is impossible to tell where they will lead but, equally, it would be prejudicial to pretend that they are not happening. In his important speech of 25 January, the South African State President indicated greater flexibility and a commitment to a fuller dialogue between his Government and black opinion in South Africa. The Council should encourage dialogue between the South African Government and a fully representative cross-section of black South African opinion. The Council must not rule out peaceful change, but must press for the fundamental reforms which will be needed to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of South Africa's black majority. We therefore do not interpret the reference to the legitimacy of the struggle as relating to armed struggle or extending to the use of force.

23. My Government's concern about the recent arrest of leading members of the UDF, a non-violent organization, is a matter of public record and has been expressed directly to the South African Government. It would of course be wrong for the Council to prejudge the outcome of legal proceedings, or to take action which could have an adverse effect on those concerned. That is not the purpose of the draft resolution, which in its revised form simply appeals for the charges of high treason to be dropped.

24. In the belief that a message from a divided Council would have been counter-productive, my delegation has worked hard with other members to try to secure a consensus. While I must reiterate my Government's previous reservations about certain aspects of the draft resolution, including the tendency to exaggerate an already serious situation, I must also express our satisfaction that, thanks to the constructive spirit on all sides, a consensus has been achieved which reflects the broad concerns of the Council.

25. Like others who are looking for rapid and peaceful change in South Africa, the British Government hopes that the ideas outlined in President Botha's speech will be followed, at a very early date, by the implementation of major reforms; and that we shall forthwith see an end to violence and repression, and the urgent initiation of a genuine dialogue within South Africa.

26. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put the draft resolution contained in document S/17013/Rev.1 to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously [resolution 560 (1985)].

27. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to make statements after the voting.

28. Mr. CLARK (United States of America): The Government and the people of the United States share the deep sense of concern expressed by other members of this body in regard to a number of recent developments inside South Africa, in particular the continuing civil unrest in various parts of the country and the arrest of 16 opposition leaders on charges of high treason. We share also, therefore, in the general sentiments contained in the resolution we have just adopted and in the deep feelings of those who put it forward.

29. The view of the United States Government on the question of *apartheid* is very clear. We have stated it frequently, forcefully and at the highest level: we abhor *apartheid*. Institutionalized racial discrimination is contrary to those ideals which animate political and economic life in our country. It is contrary to everything our country stands for and believes in. We have made our feelings on *apartheid* known, moreover, not in rhetorical flourishes and by hurling insults and condemnations, but in direct and forceful discussions with the South African Government itself.

30. Our goal has been to promote reform in South Africa. We seek to encourage the transformation of South Africa into a society that provides equal opportunity for all its people—a society that provides all people the opportunity to live in dignity and to enjoy the full social, political and economic benefits of the land of their birth. We seek this transformation through peace, not through violence; through evolution, not revolution. We have committed ourselves and our influence to this endeavour.

31. The process of transformation—a transformation that can lead to a government fully representative of all South Africa's peoples and based on the consent of the governed—is a process in which all South Africans should be involved. The process is complex and is bound to be arduous. Our role is to encourage and, to the extent possible, to facilitate the process of change. It is our judgement that a genuine process of reform is under way in South Africa and that the Government of that country has made its decision to move away from *apartheid*. This has created a new dynamic of change. Further change is not only desirable, it is inevitable. Important decisions and commitments have already been made and we recognize these. At the same time, much more must be done.

32. It is our strongly held view that a dialogue among all South Africans is a key step—indeed, an essential step—in the process of reform. It is in this context that we deeply regret the arrest of 16 opposition leaders in South Africa and the decision to press charges of treason against those individuals. It is not for us to take a position on the validity of these charges, since as yet the trials have not begun and no evidence has been presented. There is a real

question, moreover, of the capacity of the United Nations to sit in judgement over the legal processes of a Member State. One is reminded of the saying about glass houses. Rather, our concern over the impending trials in South Africa stems not only from our strong commitment to human rights throughout the world but also from the fact that the very decision of the South African Government to seek these trials detracts from that Government's own stated commitment to seek a dialogue with black leaders. In the present circumstances, the trials are inopportune and are bound to detract from the success of this dialogue.

33. The continuing civil unrest in South Africa is also a matter of deep concern to the United States. Our sympathy of course goes out to the homeless, the jobless, to those unable to acquire an adequate education and to the other downtrodden elements of that society. In South Africa, as elsewhere, we recognize the need to remedy the injustices of the past and, especially, to put an end to those that continue. We can only reiterate our encouragement and our willingness and determination to help in any way we can. It is our deepest desire that the changes that must come, and will come, to South Africa be undertaken without recourse to further bloodshed, and that dialogue replace confrontation. We call on the Government of South Africa to move forward with all possible haste on the reforms it has outlined, to move forward with the upgrading of Crossroads and its transformation into a permanent residential area, to move forward to end all forced removals, to move forward with the expansion of residency rights for all its people and, indeed, to move forward towards the society of equal justice under law that we all wish to see.

34. Despite our strongly held views on the need for change in South Africa, there are specific formulations in the resolution which we have just adopted to which we must take some exception. In particular, we have objected to the prejudging of the judicial process in South Africa. We regret that the resolution neglected to call for observance of judicial due process, including such important elements as a speedy trial and access to legal counsel. We also regret deviations from language proper to a Security Council resolution.

35. In spite of these reservations, our strongly held views on the situation in South Africa have led us to join with others in consensus within the Council.

36. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): Permit me first of all to express the heartfelt sympathy and condolences of my delegation to the representative of the Soviet Union and his delegation on the sad passing away of Mr. Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. As our Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, stated in his message of condolence, President Chernenko dedicated his life to the welfare of his country and served the people of the Soviet Union from a young age in many different and responsible capacities. In the international field too, President Chernenko took many initiatives for peace and to contain the nuclear arms race. I should like to request the representative of the Soviet Union to convey our sentiments of sympathy and condolence to his Government and to the bereaved family.

37. Allow me also to take a moment to convey my gratitude to the many speakers here this morning and earlier this month who have made many kind references to my country and to me personally for my conduct of the presidency of the Council for the month of February. May I also take this opportunity to felicitate you, Mr. President, on your exemplary conduct of our proceedings and to renew to you our fullest support in the discharge of your onerous responsibilities.

38. The Council has just adopted resolution 560 (1985). It has done so unanimously. The sponsors of the resolution—Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Madagascar, Peru and Trinidad and Tobago—feel gratified that the spirit of flexibility and accommodation displayed by them in agreeing to a number of amendments has helped secure unanimity in support for the text from members of the Council.

39. With this resolution the Council has sent a clear and unequivocal message to Pretoria—a message which reiterates the universal condemnation of the policies of the racist minority régime, a message which categorically affirms that the Council and the international community cannot and will not countenance the continued practice of *apartheid*, that it will not tolerate the killing of defenceless people, that opposition to and struggle against *apartheid* is not treason but, quite on the contrary, entirely legitimate, to be commended and deserving of support. The Council has called directly on South Africa to withdraw the charges of high treason against the UDF officials concerned and immediately and unconditionally to release them, as well as all political prisoners and detainees in South Africa.

40. To the many freedom-loving persons now languishing in South African prisons, the message is that they and the millions of oppressed and dispossessed people of South Africa are not forgotten in their plight and predicament. The Council's resolution is a beacon of hope and a manifestation of the international community's solidarity with and support for them in their noble cause and just struggle.

41. The arrogant statement of the representative of South Africa to which you, Mr. President, speaking as representative of Madagascar a few minutes ago, referred, deserves an appropriate rebuttal. The resolution now adopted by the Council represents just that.

42. The Council has spoken with one voice. The significance of this fact will, we are sure, not be lost on the Pretoria régime.

43. Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation expresses its deep thanks to the representative of Guinea, who spoke also as the Chairman of the Group of African States, and the representative of India, who

expressed their sympathy on the death of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. We shall pass on these expressions of sympathy to the Soviet Government and to the family of Mr. Chernenko.

44. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Council has thus completed the present stage of its consideration of the agenda item before it.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York

00300

90-61439—June 1994—1,925

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2575th MEETING: 17 APRIL 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2575)	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/17093)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2575th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 17 April 1985, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. Javier ARIAS STELLA (Peru).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2575)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:
   Report of Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/17093)

The meeting was called to order at 11.35 a.m.

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): As this is the first meeting of the Security Council for the month of April, I should like first to pay tribute on behalf of the Council to Mr. Blaise Rabetafika, representative of Madagascar and President of the Council for the month of March, for the wisdom and great diplomatic skill with which he conducted the business of the Council last month. I am sure I express the feelings of all members of the Council in sincerely thanking Mr. Rabetafika for his work as President.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:
Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (S/17093)

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Lebanon in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite him to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fakhoury (Lebanon) took a place at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) for the period from 10 October 1984 to 11 April 1985 [*S/17093*]. Members of the Council have also received document S/17100, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in Council consultations. I wish to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/17062, which contains the text of a letter dated 27 March from the representative of Lebanon to the Secretary-General, and S/17067, which contains the text of a letter dated 29 March from the Secretary-General to the President of the Council.

4. I understand that the Council is prepared to proceed to vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection I shall now put it to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The draft resolution was adopted by 13 votes to none, with 2 abstentions [resolution 561 (1985)].

5. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): Mr. President, since this is the first meeting of the Council in April, it gives me great pleasure, as the representative of a fellow Pacific-Ocean country, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency. I am confident that you will guide our deliberations with your well-known skill. Equally as the representative of an Indian-Ocean country, I salute the very great skill with which the representative of Madagascar guided the Council during the month of March.

6. My delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution just before the Council. Australia has been a strong supporter of the peace-keeping role of the United Nations. It has been a generous and willing contributor of funds for UNIFIL operations. That support will continue.

7. We recognize the dangers and difficulties under which UNIFIL operates. These difficulties have been outlined clearly in the last report of the Secretary-General

and in the letter to him from the troop-contributing countries [*S/17067, annex*].

8. We deplore all acts of violence in Lebanon, especially those which make difficult the effective operation of UNIFIL and which endanger civilian lives.

9. The resolution which the Council has just adopted reiterates that UNIFIL should fully implement its mandate as defined in the resolutions of the Council.

10. It remains Australia's hope that the parties concerned can create the conditions necessary for the effective operation of UNIFIL. In this context, we look forward to Israel's complete withdrawal from Lebanon and the return of the sovereignty of the Lebanese Government over its territory, both of which Australia holds as important objectives.

11. Clearly, in the months ahead the Council will need to consider what future role may be open to UNIFIL. This is particularly important given the present critical phase in UNIFIL's operations. It will be necessary for the Council to consider in a timely manner how it will address the important issues involved. The Australian delegation stands ready to contribute constructively to this work.

12. We note that the Secretary-General has foreshadowed the need for some new consultations between the two parties to consider UNIFIL's future role as the Israeli forces withdraw from southern Lebanon. Australia would support any such co-operation with the Secretary-General and would hope that the two countries concerned would agree to participate in such discussions.

13. Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): First of all, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of April. It has just been demonstrated that the Council is able to do constructive work under your wise guidance. I also want to pay tribute to the representative of Madagascar, Mr. Rabetafika, for the gentle, good-humoured and extremely skilful way in which he guided the work of the Council during the busy month of March.

14. It is indeed gratifying to note that our decision today to prolong the mandate of UNIFIL coincides with the process finally under way of Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon. Thus the moment seems appropriate for reflection on the role of UNIFIL in this process and in the wake of the complete withdrawal of the Israeli forces, to which the Government of Israel has committed itself.

15. Developments in southern Lebanon during the last months have clearly demonstrated that violence breeds violence. The threat or use of force will not bring genuine peace and stability to the area. On the contrary, it will only engender counteraction, which is bound to lead to a further deterioration of the situation. This cannot be in the interest of any of the parties concerned.

16. In his latest report on UNIFIL the Secretary-General rightly points out that the best means of achieving peace and security in Lebanon south of the Litani River after the Israeli withdrawal would be an orderly take-over from the Israeli forces, with the ultimate aim of restoring the complete authority of the Lebanese Government and army in that area. As is stressed by the Secretary-General, this requires some form of consultative mechanism under United Nations auspices, and Denmark urges both parties to resume talks as soon as possible in order to achieve this purpose.

17. My Government believes that UNIFIL should be assigned important tasks in the process, taking into account the legitimate security interests of all parties concerned and thus finally allowing the Force to play the role originally envisaged for it in Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978).

18. In this connection, it should be borne in mind that even under the most adverse circumstances the Force has in the past amply demonstrated its ability to reduce considerably violence in the area of operation and even to bring complete quiet to the area when all parties supported and co-operated with it.

19. Denmark thus fully understands and shares the position and concerns about the future role of UNIFIL which the troop-contributing countries expressed in their letter of 28 March [*ibid.*]. We join in their urgent call upon the Governments of Israel and Lebanon to meet the requirements necessary to ensure security for all concerned in the area in the wake of the complete Israeli withdrawal.

20. We owe it to the troop-contributing Governments, and indeed to the very concept of United Nations peacekeeping forces, to secure at least the minimum conditions from the effective future work of UNIFIL as outlined by the Secretary-General in his report.

21. We interpret the resolution just adopted by the Council as endorsing further action by the Secretary-General along the lines described in his report. Like him, we do not believe that it is in the interest of any of those concerned to allow a situation to arise in which violence is likely to continue and escalate and in which UNIFIL will find itself once again in a position of embarrassment, ineffectiveness and even danger.

22. Finally, I should like to pay tribute to General Callaghan, his staff, the officers and the men of UNIFIL and the military observers of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) for their continued dedication to their task and courage in extremely difficult circumstances, as well as to the Secretary-General and the Secretariat for their untiring efforts in promoting peace in Lebanon.

23. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): Mr. President, may I offer congratulations to Peru. It is a mark of your country's international achievements and of the wealth of talent in Peru that two Peruvians should be sitting together at the head of this horseshoe table today. We know your own talents and your own achievements, Sir, and we welcome you to the presidency.

24. The month of March was a particularly arduous one, and this makes us all the more grateful to our colleague of Madagascar for the patient, skilful and effective way in which he guided our activities in that month.

25. My delegation set out the British Government's views on the situation in southern Lebanon when the Council met to consider the matter last mongh [*2570th meeting*]. These views have not changed. Regrettably, since that time there has been no improvement in the situation. The withdrawal of Israeli forces has continued, but it has been accompanied by a further escalation of violence and retaliation which has solved nothing and only added to the sufferings of the civilian population. Outsiders have been sucked in too. Several of my countrymen have been kidnapped. One of them, Mr. Alec Collett, who was working for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East in Lebanon, is still being held. I appeal in this forum for his release.

26. The overriding need now in southern Lebanon is for the cessation of violence on all sides. The first essential towards achieving this is the continuation and completion of the long-overdue withdrawal of all Israeli forces from all Lebanese territory. In the mean time, until its forces have withdrawn south of the border, Israel should scrupulously observe both the letter and the spirit of the Geneva conventions. A continuation of its "iron fist" policy will serve only to fan the flames of violence and make it more difficult to achieve the security which it seeks for northern Israel.

27. The Secretary-General has given us his considered views of the present situation in the observations contained in his latest report. My Government fully supports the efforts he has been making and the views and recommendations contained in the report. We had hoped that by this time agreement might have been reached on having UNIFIL deploy to the international border in fulfilment of its original mandate. We continue to believe with the Secretary-General that the Council's objectives must be to secure a speedy, orderly and complete withdrawal of Israeli forces, to establish international peace and security in the area and to restore effective Lebanese authority and sovereignty up to the internationally recognized border. These words should be given their full and precise meaning. Thus they exclude completely any residual Israeli presence or some kind of "security zone" controlled by groups unauthorized by the Lebanese Government.

28. The Secretary-General has said that he believes the best means of achieving these objectives would be an orderly take-over from the withdrawing Israeli forces by UNIFIL together with units of the Lebanese army. We agree. We share his concern that unless some orderly way is found to achieve this, the situation is likely to continue to deteriorate to the grave disadvantage of all concerned. Some consultative mechanism is therefore essential to the process, as the Secretary-General has pointed out. We welcome the Secretary-General's offer to convoke a new conference of Israeli and Lebanese military representatives for this purpose. We urge both sides to accept this offer and to find means of co-operating on security in the border area to reduce the possibility of further violence.

29. At the same time, steps will need to be taken to ensure that UNIFIL is able to carry out safely and effectively the role entrusted to it. We have the utmost sympathy for the concerns of the troop contributors as expressed in their letter of 28 March. All concerned, particularly the Lebanese and Israeli authorities and the population of the area, have a duty to ensure UNIFIL's effective operation. An important step towards achieving this would be, as the Secretary-General has suggested, to arrive at a clear understanding that no armed military or paramilitary personnel of any kind other than UNIFIL and the Lebanese army should be allowed to operate in UNIFIL's area and that all parties and elements should give UNIFIL their explicit support and co-operation.

30. My Government is fully aware of the difficulties in the way of achieving a diplomatic solution on these lines. The situation is both complex and inflamed by the escalating violence. Today's events in Lebanon serve to underline these difficulties. But in our view they only strengthen the need for a diplomatic solution in southern Lebanon. The restoration of peace, security and normality there will be of benefit to the whole of Lebanon. The Secretary-General must continue his efforts in pursuance of the resolution just adopted, and the Governments concerned must give him their full co-operation. Delay will only make matters worse.

31. In the mean time, we are continuing to provide UNIFIL with substantial help over logistics and have given our support to the renewal of UNIFIL's mandate for a further six months. In doing so, we note that the Secretary-General has left open the possibility of reporting again to the Council in the near future. We believe that this is right and that the Council should be prepared during the next six months to give further thought to UNIFIL's mandate as soon as there is an opportunity for making progress. For the time being, the Force can continue to play a helpful role in the area while a way is sought for it to fulfil its original mandate. It is a troubled and difficult role to ask of the Force and the troop-contributing Governments They richly deserve the continuing gratitude and support of the international community, especially since, as the Secretary-General has once again been obliged to point out, the Organization is increasingly far behind in their reimbursement. We look to the Israeli and Lebanese authorities to ensure that the major financial and political contribution which most of the international community is making is keeping UNIFIL in place is not wasted.

32. In closing, I should like once again to pay a sincere tribute to General Callaghan and all the personnel of UNIFIL and UNTSO for the courage and skill which they continue to bring to their task. Their dedication is an example to us all. We for our part must now work, as I have just described, for the peaceful solution that will show that their efforts have not been in vain.

33. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): First, I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the post of President of the Council and at the same time express the conviction that, under your highly enlightened guidance, the Council will be able to cope successfully with the very responsible

tasks which are now before it. Like the representative of Australia, I can welcome you also as the representative of a country whose shores, like those of the Soviet Union, are on the Pacific. We wish you every success.

34. I should like to take this opportunity also to express our profound gratitude to the representative of Madagascar, Mr. Rabetafika, for the exemplary way in which he performed the functions of President of the Council during the month of March. That period turned out to be an extremely heavy one for all members of the Council, but of course the main burden fell squarely on the President's shoulders.

35. Last month marked seven years since UNIFIL was established. This is the seventeenth time now that the Council has had to extend that Force's mandate for a further period of six months. These figures in themselves indicate quite eloquently that the presence of the interim forces in Lebanon has become a protracted one.

36. The reasons for such a situation are well known. After the invasion of Lebanon in March 1978, Israel, in violation of Security Council resolutions, transferred the regions bordering on southern Lebanon to its puppets among the local mercenaries and in that way virtually refused to leave Lebanon. Then, as a result of further acts of aggression by Israel in June 1982, the United Nations forces found themselves far behind the occupying forces. Since then, Tel Aviv has been systematically and stubbornly refusing to carry out the clear-cut demands of the Council and the entire international community for the unconditional withdrawal of its troops from all Lebanese territory. In the light of that fact, it is Israel's fault that to this day UNIFIL has no opportunity to perform the functions entrusted to it—the main one being to monitor the withdrawal of the aggressor's forces behind the international frontier. This fact is quite properly underlined in the report of the Secretary-General which is now before the Council.

37. For almost three years now, Israel has continued to hold sway on Lebanese soil. Virtually isolating the southern part of Lebanon, the occupiers have turned it into a realm of violence, and daily they perpetrate new crimes there. Shooting, mass searches, arrests, demolition of houses, collective punishment and derisive treatment of the Arab population are the characteristic signature of those who only recently, without a hint of embarrassment, affirmed that they had brought 40 years of peace to the people of Lebanon.

38. Israeli repression has been particularly stepped up in recent months after the initiation of the forced relocation of the aggressor's forces under the pressure of the liberation struggle that has been unleashed by the Lebanese patriots. According to the report of the Secretary-General, in the period from February to the beginning of April of this year alone the occupiers carried out 32 major punitive operations against villages in the southern part of Lebanon as a result of which large segments of the population suffered

39. We are therefore completely justified in stating that the Israeli military has unleashed nothing less than a terroristic war in the southern part of Lebanon against the local civilian population, one which they have officially dubbed "the iron-fist policy". At the same time, the Israelis have systematically flouted the most elementary norms of international law and the fundamental provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949[1]. An example of this is the recent decision taken by the occupying authorities that more than 1,100 prisoners be transferred from Ansar concentration camp to Israeli territory, which runs directly counter to articles 49 and 76 of the aforementioned Convention.

40. We must focus separately on the Israeli occupiers' arrogant attitude towards UNIFIL personnel. We fully share the concern voiced on this score by the Secretary-General and those States which have supplied contingents to UNIFIL. As the report makes abundantly clear, there have been frequent instances when forces belonging to Israel, which is a Member of the United Nations, and their henchmen opened fire on UNIFIL personnel. Obstacles continue to be placed in the way of the normal functioning of United Nations forces, making it impossible for them to fulfil the tasks entrusted to them by the Security Council.

41. The Soviet delegation emphasizes once again that it is the bounden duty of the Council to ensure respect for the United Nations flag and for UNIFIL. The Council should brook no intervention in its activities, as it has directly insisted in past decisions, particularly in resolution 523 (1982). We think it would also be desirable for the Secretary-General to continue his practice of informing the Council of any instances when the forces are not in a position to perform their functions.

42. With reference to the situation in the southern part Lebanon, we cannot fail to advert to the fact that the lawless activities of the Israeli authorities in that part of the world have twice—in September 1984 and March 1985—been considered in the Council. In both instances the discussion led to an identical outcome: a veto cast by the United States against the Lebanese draft resolutions [*S/16732 and S/17000*], which asked that Israel merely act in accordance with the decisions of the Council and that it cease its terrorism against the civilian population in the occupied areas of Lebanon. That position taken by the United States has been assessed, quite rightly, not only as a political cover for its junior partner in the strategic alliance but also as a direct encouragement of that partner to pursue its inhuman policy towards Lebanon.

43. The Soviet Union is firm in condemning the ongoing Israeli aggression in Lebanon and reaffirms its solidarity with the people of that country who are struggling for their legitimate rights against the Israeli occupation.

44. The key to a solution of the Lebanese problem has been clearly set forth in Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), the latter demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from the entire territory of Lebanon. Those resolutions must be acted upon. It is essential to guarantee respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the State of Lebanon and to put an

end to the mistreatment of the civilian population, including the Palestinian refugees in the camps. The withdrawal of Israeli forces to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon would, of course, also create conditions that would enable UNIFIL finally to have an opportunity properly to perform the functions entrusted to it.

45. In the light of the foregoing and of the request of the Government of Lebanon, the Soviet delegation has decided not to object to the renewal of the UNIFIL mandate for a further term. At the same time, we should like to reiterate and reconfirm our fundamental position with regard to that Force, including the method by which it is financed. It is our understanding that, as indicated in the Secretary-General's report, should any fresh trends emerge as the situation develops, he will submit a further report to the Council, which would then, if necessary, meet again to take any necessary decisions.

46. Mr. KÉMOULARIA (France) (*interpretation from French*): It is my pleasure to join my colleagues in paying a tribute to you, Sir, and to wish you a presidency free from any untoward crises. Your first remarks have amply shown that you possess the necessary experience and skills for your task, and, like my colleagues, I am certain that the Council is in good hands this month. Let me also take this opportunity to say that relations between my country and yours are warm and that they have been so for many long years. I am particularly gratified, therefore, to express my esteem to you.

47. I wish also to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Mr. Blaise Rabetafika, who in difficult circumstances gave proof both of great human qualities and of diplomatic skills—to which I would add the fact that he never lost his good humour, an element I deem extremely important to the good work of the Council, whatever the problem we may be considering.

48. Once again, through its vote in favour of the renewal of the mandate of UNIFIL, France has expressed its support for the Force's activities and role. Indeed, my country considers that, in spite of the many obstacles, both *de facto* and *de jure*, placed in the way of its activities, the effect of UNIFIL has been a positive one. No one can challenge the fact that despite the difficulties it has encountered on many sides that have particularly affected—as all here know—the French contingent, UNIFIL has been able to limit the scope of the incidents that have occurred within its zone of operation. I should like to take the opportunity provided by today's meeting to pay a special tribute to all the members of UNIFIL under the command of General Callaghan, to whom I extend a warm greeting here today. In any event, the Force must, as soon as possible, be put in a position fully to carry out its mandate as set forth in resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978).

49. As members of the Council know, France has spared no efforts to make its presence in the UNIFIL count and to ensure that the troop strength of the French contingent continues at the high level that has hitherto been maintained. In our view, however, we must constantly see to it that UNIFIL plays the most useful role possible in the interests of Lebanon and of the civilian populations of that region, which continue to endure such harsh trials.

50. In voting in favour of the renewal of UNIFIL's mandate, France has wished once again to demonstrate its commitment to the unity, territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon. However, my country would express the strong wish that during this new six-month period the Secretary-General, whose report has received our full attention, will continue to an even greater degree to study and, if need be, to foster all necessary measures to ensure the full discharge of UNIFIL's mandate.

51. Mr. SCHIFTER (United States of America): I too want to join our colleagues in extending congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the office of President of the Council for this month. Indeed, I would like to say that I associate myself with the remarks made by the representative of the United Kingdom concerning Peru's representation at this table. I would also like to extend our thanks to Mr. Rabetafika for the truly outstanding manner in which he conducted the Council's proceedings during the month of March.

52. The United States has voted in favour of extending the mandate of UNIFIL because we believe that UNIFIL can help create stable conditions in southern Lebanon in the months ahead. We are of the view, however, that such a contribution to stability can be made only if all the parties involved agree to co-operate in UNIFIL'S mission. It is for that reason that we support most strongly the Secretary-General's suggestion that a consultative mechanism be created under United Nations auspices—such as perhaps renewal of the Naqoura talks—whose purpose it would be to effect the needed co-operation of the parties so that constructive results can indeed be attained.

53. As the Secretary-General has noted, UNIFIL was able in the early years of its operations to bring about a significant reduction of violence in its zone of operation. In doing so, it served valiantly in dangerous and volatile circumstances. More recently, UNIFIL has provided protection and humanitarian assistance to the residents of the area of its operation, serving as a focus of civil order respected by the population and thus continuing to contribute to efforts to achieve stability in the area. However, as many parties, most particularly the troop contributors, have pointed out, UNIFIL has in recent years faced increasingly anomalous conditions, which have pointed up the fact that the Force's present restricted role is both inappropriate and unsatisfactory.

54. This appraisal of present conditions leads us to the conclusion that a clarification of UNIFIL's role, agreed upon by the parties concerned, must be achieved soon to adapt to a situation which will arise as Israel completes its withdrawal. Neither the troop contributors, nor the Secretary-General, nor the Council, can be expected to continue supporting the mission of the Force unless such a clarification is agreed upon in the months ahead. The present extension of the mandate, for which we voted because

of our strong commitment to UNIFIL's potential role in Lebanese peace-keeping, could well be the last interim extension that the international community would be prepared to support.

55. As the Secretary-General stated in his report, we all owe to the cause of peace and stability, the troop contributors and the United Nations itself, our best efforts to ensure that UNIFIL's present highly unsatisfactory situation does not continue. We therefore urge all parties to redouble efforts during the coming mandate period to achieve an agreed role for UNIFIL, a role that utilizes its potential and assigns to it an important task in the continuing international effort to restore Lebanese sovereignty and peaceful conditions in southern Lebanon.

56. As to the comments offered by our colleague from the Soviet Union concerning the votes cast by the United States on the two draft resolutions to which he referred, let me say simply that our reasons for voting as we did were fully explained at the time these votes were cast. We regret that the Soviet Union considered it necessary to use this occasion to direct criticisms at us once again. We do not believe that the comments require any further elaboration on our part.

57. Mr. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): It gives me great pleasure to convey my congratulations to you, Sir, on your accession to the presidency of the Council for the month of April. Given your well-known abilities, we look forward to a continued period of wise and efficient guidance under your presidency.

58. May I also take this opportunity to convey to your predecessor, the representative of Madagascar, our appreciation for the skilful and efficient manner in which he conducted the business of the Council during the month of March.

59. My Government firmly believes that the presence of UNIFIL in southern Lebanon can be an essential factor of stability in the region, contributing to the maintenance of Lebanon's territorial sovereignty and integrity and to its political independence; it can also help to ensure the return of effective State authority in the area. However, in order that the peace-keeping operation of the Force may attain the objectives of its original mandate as laid down in resolution 425 (1978), certain conditions must be fulfilled.

60. First of all, the terms of the relevant resolution must be fully implemented. In this regard, we have welcomed the decisions of the Government of Israel to withdraw all its forces from Lebanon. Their withdrawal to the internationally recognized borders is an essential prerequisite to peace. We have noted that the initial steps taken by the Government of Israel to translate this decision into reality are already in force.

61. Next, the security of all the members of the peace-keeping forces and of all United Nations personnel operating in the area must be safeguarded. My Government views with concern the high number of casualties suffered among the ranks of those forces, as well as the increasing security risks with which they are confronted; it consequently calls for the full co-operation of all parties concerned and for the cessation of threats and acts of violence, from whatever source. The civilian population of Lebanon also has suffered more than can be justified in any circumstances.

62. My Government wishes at this time to express its appreciation to those countries which have provided troops to UNIFIL. We regard their contribution as a tangible commitment to uphold the ideals and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. We wish also to compliment the Secretary-General on his succinct report on UNIFIL. More important, we wish to commend his continuing efforts to obtain the agreement of the parties involved in order to ensure the smooth functioning of UNIFIL in southern Lebanon.

63. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago reiterates its support for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon, and supports the extension of the mandate of UNIFIL which expires on 19 April 1985, for a further period of six months. Let me take this opportunity also to pay a tribute to the patience, courage and dedication of the officers, men and staff of the Force, who serve in the most taxing and complex conditions. Such commitment demands, on our part, nothing but our unstinting support. They are prepared to make the supreme sacrifice; we can do no less than to support them in all matters and in every manner we can.

64. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of Lebanon, on whom I now call.

65. Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Let me congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month and to assure you of our confidence in your ability and long diplomatic experience, which guarantee that the work of the Council will be well guided.

66. I wish also to thank your predecessor, Mr. Blaise Rabetafika, representative of Madagascar, for his activities and endeavours, and for the ability and statesmanship he displayed during his term as President of the Council last month.

67. Five newly elected members have joined the Council this year, and I wish to extend my sincere congratulations to the representatives of Autralia, Denmark, Madagascar, Thailand and Trinidad and Tobago. I wish them success in their tasks and look forward to their co-operation with colleagues on the Council towards the attainment of the objectives for which it was established. I am confident that they will discharge the great responsibility associated with membership of the Council.

68. After witnessing the Council adopt the draft resolution to renew the mandate of UNIFIL for six months and hearing the statements of some members of the Council, I

must express the thanks of the Lebanese Government and the Lebanese delegation for the Council's responsiveness to Lebanon's request and the recommendation of the Secretary-General contained in his report. We extend thanks and appreciation to him for the report, which in our view portrays a painful reality and reflects his concern and that of the troop-contributing countries about the future status of the Force.

69. That concern is the inevitable result of Israel's disruption of the Naqoura talks and its insistence on refusing to implement Council decisions calling for it to withdraw fully from Lebanese territories and enable UNIFIL to deploy along the international borders, making southern Lebanon a zone of security and peace. Israel's insistence on establishing a security belt in Lebanese territory, excluding UNIFIL and the Lebanese army, is a flagrant defiance of the Council, a deliberate flouting of its resolutions, a cynical disregard for the international Organization and its forces and an undermining of the endeavours of the Secretary-General and his assistants—especially the efforts made by the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs, Mr. Brian Urquhart, and Mr. Jean-Claude Aimé, on the instructions of the Secretary-General.

70. In this regard, I should like to express to Mr. Urquhart the appreciation of the Lebanese Government for his endeavours and its confidence in him, in the hope that those endeavours will continue with a view to attaining the full implementation of the resolutions of the Council.

71. I must also express the thanks and appreciation of the Government of Lebanon to the troop-contributing countries and to the Commander of the Force, General Callaghan, its officers, soldiers and staff. The demeanour and actions of the Force and the fact that it has withstood, under difficult circumstances, various pressures and practices whose source is well known to the Council deserve a generous tribute. The Secretary-General devoted part of his report to those pressures and practices and enumerated acts of aggression against some UNIFIL units by the Israeli army during the past six months. He also enumerated some Israeli practices against Lebanese cities and villages, and the arbitrary measures taken against Lebanese civilians.

72. We regard the Council's adoption of the draft resolution as further affirmation of its commitment to its previous resolutions and its insistence on implementing them in order to enable UNIFIL to discharge its assigned tasks of securing full Israeli withdrawal from Lebanese territories, assisting the Lebanese State to exercise its sovereignty and authority over all Lebanese territory up to the internationally recognized borders and transforming the south into a zone of peace and security.

73. In my letter of 27 March this year to the Secretary-General [*S/17062*], I defined Lebanon's position with regard to UNIFIL and Lebanon's understanding of the role it is required to play. That position and understanding are consistent with the Secretary-General's report, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, with the letter dated 28 March to the Secretary-General from the representatives of the troop-contributing countries [*S/17067, annex*].

74. First, the UNIFIL area of deployment extends from the Litani River southward as far as the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon. Secondly, the whole of this region should be under the exclusive authority of the Lebanese army, assisted in its task solely by the United Nations Force, since Lebanon does not accept any role for any military force which is not a legal force. Thirdly, Lebanon is in no circumstance prepared to accept the creation of what are known as buffer zones or of security belts of any kind inside its territory, something that by implication has been rejected by all the resolutions of the Council that provided for the withdrawal of all Israeli forces beyond the internationally recognized borders of Lebanon. Fourthly, the area of deployment of UNIFIL should not become a disengagement zone between illegal armed forces within Lebanese te[illegible]ory. Fifthly, UNIFIL's posts and area of deployment wi[illegible]termined by agreement with the Lebanese Governme[illegible]one.

75. While my G[illegible]ernment is convinced that UNIFIL's presence is an essential and basic factor for stability in southern Lebanon, it is also convinced that the provision of a minimum degree of security for the work of the Force is also basic and necessary. Therefore, Lebanon is still ready to co-operate with the Security Council, the Secretariat and UNIFIL to the greatest extent within the scope of its understanding of the future role of the Force and in accordance with its position with regard to the Force, which is fully in support of the provisions of the Council's resolutions.

76. Israel, which has consistently refused to assign any role to UNIFIL, must abide by those resolutions to allow UNIFIL to undertake the tasks mandated to it.

77. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Israel in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

It was so decided.

78. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): I invite the representative of Israel to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

79. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I should like first to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We have seen your wise counsel here, and we have confidence in your stewardship. I should like also to congratulate the representative of Madagascar for the successful completion of last month's presidency.

80. My Government has made its policy on Lebanon quite clear in various statements, including those that I have made here. I do not want to take up the Council's time on this; I want to make a few brief points on Lebanon that pertain to today's discussion and then to respond to one of the speakers in particular.

81. The first point is this. We welcome the Secretary-General's call to reconvene a forum of consultations. We were not the ones who broke the talks in Naqoura. We suffered, I would say, great pains of frustration because we were unable to find a serious interlocutor in Naqoura. I am sure I represent the feeling of my Government when I say that we are delighted to hear the expression of a new willingness on the part of the Lebanese to reconvene at Naqoura, and we will be very happy to return to those talks or to another forum to discuss ways of establishing peace and tranquillity in the south of Lebanon.

82. The second point is this. What is the problem we are facing? We are facing the problem of how to stop cross-border attacks once Israel completes its withdrawal. The representative of Lebanon has talked about the the Lebanese army, as have others here. Well, which army are we talking about? Is it the army that is regrettably unable today to keep the peace in Beirut, where dozens of people are being slaughtered, or in Burj Al-Barajneh, or in Sidon? This is an army that cannot keep peace in its own backyard, and it is being asked to police a very large area, for which, to be realistic, we believe it is not equipped. That is my second observation, and I make it, I must say, with regret.

83. The third point relates to the suggestion that UNIFIL fulfil this function. I think there is a confusion—a confusion in good faith—among some of the representatives on the difference between peace-keeping and peace-enforcing. The task of policing a border strip against the infiltration of terrorists, against rocketing and shelling, is not merely a peace-keeping function; it is a peace-enforcing function, which an international force, by its very nature and inherent structure, is not organized to carry out. Having spoken with quite a few of the representatives of the troop-contributing countries, I know there is growing recognition that that is the case here.

84. This leads to my fourth point, namely, that the security of northern Israel and the prevention of terrorist attacks is something that Israel does not expect others to take upon themselves. The Israel Defence Forces will assume that function from our own lines, from our side of the borders. And however difficult a task that may be, it will not be assisted by the introduction of forces that are really unsuited or unable to perform that function.

85. My next remarks relate to the words we heard here from the Soviet representative. He chose to lecture us on the evils of occupation. He spoke of puppets and local mercenaries, of a realm of violence imposed on the occupied country, of shootings and mass searches, of collective punishment, of repression, of a terroristic war against the civilian population. I find this very encouraging. The tone was condemnatory, and I find that encouraging. I would like to ask if this indicates a change of heart or merely a sense of guilt.

86. On 13 March 1985, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights approved the report[2] of its Special Rapporteur, Felix Ermacora, on the situation of human rights in Afghanistan. The report states that "gross violations of human rights" have occurred in Afghanistan. It lists a host of abuses committed during the Soviet occupation, including the maiming of children by booby-trap toys, the wholesale destruction of agriculture and the deliberate bombing of hospitals. The report cites Afghan witnesses and talks of four specific examples when massacres of civilians took place between 1982 and 1984. It says, for example, that on 12 October 1983, in villages in the province of Kandahar, "360 people were executed in the village square, including 20 young girls and about 20 old people". The Soviets, the report says, have both "spread the extent of the violence" in Afghanistan and "brought about a selective suppression" of people who oppose communist policies. It says that, after the Soviet forces joined the combat, hostilities reached unprecedented proportions involving "systematic bombardment of a number of villages" and terror directed against civilians. The result of all these activities is that more than half of the pre-invasion population of Afghanistan—approximately 17 million people—have been forced to become refugees, either in another country or as internal refugees within Afghanistan.

87. So what is the Soviet record in Afghanistan? It is a record of daily random bombings and maimings and killings of children and civilians; it is a record of the destruction of schools, hospitals and mosques; it is a record of the destruction of crop lands and irrigation systems, of the use of chemicals, of the burning of thousands of acres of forest; it is a record of imprisonment and torture. It is, in short, a record that at the very least should direct the Soviet representative to ashamed and painful silence.

88. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of this agenda item.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

NOTES

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[2] E/CN.4/1985/21.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61439—June 1994—1,925